DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 106 UD 018 787

TITLE	Summary and Recommendations: Conference on Pacific/Asian American Families and HEW-Related Issues.
INSTITUTION	J W K International Corp., Annandale, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Concerns (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office for Asian American Affairs.
PUB DATE	12 May 78
CONTRACT	100-77-0102
NOTE	288p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$15.39 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Asian Americans; Census Figures; Conference Reports; *Educational Problems; Employment; Family Income; *Health Needs; Immigrants; *Medical Care Evaluation; *Social Welfare; *Socioeconomic Status; Welfare Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Department Of Health Education And Welfare; *Pacific Americans

ABSTRACT

The socioeconomic needs of Pacific and Asian American (PAA) families and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare programs having the most impact on the lives of PAAs are analyzed in this conference report. An overall outline of the conference proceedings, as well as reprints of all charts and papers presented, are included. The findings of three task groups on education, health, and welfare are reported. Policy papers and program recommendations formulated by the task forces are presented and targets of opportunity are defined. Major recommendations are made with regard to the need for culturally oriented health programs, expanded health education programs, research on psychological and emotional problems, ethnocultural diseases, obtaining clearer health statistics, adult education, bilingual education, multicultural education, changes in criteria for Title XX and Social Security, extension of welfare benefits to immigrants, and consideration of PAA language and culture in designing and delivering welfare programs. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS
CONFERENCE ON PACIFIC/ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILIES
AND HEW-RELATED ISSUES

May 12, 1978

Prepared for:

The Division of Asian American Affairs, HEW

Under Contract No.:
HEW 100-77-0102

Office of Special Concerns
Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

This project has been supported with Federal funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under Contract No. HEW 100-77-0102. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This report is made pursuant to Contract No. HEW 100-77-0102. The amount charged to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the work resulting in this report (inclusive of the amounts so charged for any prior reports submitted under this contract) is $49,082. The names of the persons, employed or retained by the contractor, with managerial or professional responsibility for such work, or for the content of the report, are as follows:

Marion M. Evans

Prepared by:

JWK INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
7617 Little River Turnpike, 8th Floor
Annandale, VA 22003
703/750-3240

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD018787

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Executive Summary	ii
I.	Conference Objectives and Development of Agenda . . .	1
II.	Summation of Presentation of Speakers at the Conference.	4
III.	Task Group Recommendations.	19
IV.	Proposed Action Steps	43
	APPENDIX A - Targets of Opportunity.	A-1
	List of Participants	A-2
	APPENDIX B - Research Papers Presented at the Conference	B-1
	Institutional and Social Factors Shaping the Growth of Asian American Families. .	B-1
	The Socioeconomic Status of Asian American Families in Five Major SMSA's .	B-24
	Asian American Families.	B-108
	Public Policy Responses to Public Health Needs of Pacific/Asian American Families.	B-118
	Education and the Asian American Family.	B-159
	A Family	B-216

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Division of Asian American Affairs and the National Institute of Education jointly sponsored a conference on "Pacific and Asian American (PAA) Families and HEW-related Issues," in order:

- to provide input to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's (HEW) current family impact initiative, as well as the 1979 White House Conference on Families, and
- to further the efforts of the Office of Special Concerns to gather information from the Pacific Islander and Asian American communities about the nature and priorities of their concerns about the family.

Held on March 9-12, 1978, the conference used the expertise of the participants to formulate recommendations about those HEW programs having the most impact on the quality of life of PAA families. To this end, plenary sessions for information-sharing among the group and for presentations of research papers were coupled with a task group approach. Three task groups, which participants joined according to their interests, were formed for the component areas of HEW. Within each component area, the three most critical issues of concern to PAA families were ranked, then policy and program recommendations were developed for each issue and outlined in short policy papers.

Although Sections II and III of this report more fully discuss the nature and development of the various task group policy papers, some recommendations of task groups and of the conference as a whole can be highlighted:

Health: The conference task group found three critical areas of concern for PAA families: 1) the need to develop additional health resources to serve the presently underserved; 2) the necessity to expand health education programs to alert the communities to the risks of hypertension and substance abuse, and to provide information on ways of accessing the established delivery system; and 3) the need for research on psychological and emotional problems and possible remedies, on ethnocultural diseases of specific communities of cohorts (such as hyperuremia among Pilipinos and breast cancer among PAA women), and on ways of disaggregating health statistics so that a clearer picture is available of current morbidity and mortality.

Education: The Education Task Group identified three areas requiring urgent action: 1) adult education; 2) bilingual, bicultural education; and 3) multicultural education. These programs must assure that beneficiaries obtain the language, cognitive, and social skills needed to function successfully in a pluralistic society. Special attention should be given the particular needs of recent immigrants and their children.

Welfare: The Welfare Task Group recommends: 1) that eligibility criteria for Title XX and Social Security benefits be changed to support indigenous types of care such as in-home care of the elderly and handicapped; 2) that welfare benefits be extended to immigrants; and 3) that the language and culture of PAA families be taken into account in designing and delivering all welfare programs.

The conference found that increasing access by PAA individuals to decision making and staff positions, advisory councils, and review committees will lead to greater sensitivity to the problems and needs of the diverse population, and will contribute markedly to the greater effectiveness and efficiency of all HEW programs. The conference also recommends special set-asides for PAA programs and contractors, and the identification of and support for intermediary groups to facilitate the delivery of services.

Finally, the conference recommends that its findings concerning the impact of HEW programs on PAA families (described in detail in this report) plus supporting materials be communicated directly to those planning the White House Conference on Families so that due recognition will be given the needs of this diverse, changing and growing segment of the national population.

I. CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES AND DEVELOPMENT OF AGENDA

A. Origination and Objectives of the Conference

As part of the on-going effort of the Office of Special Concerns under the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HEW, to gather information about the needs and problems of its constituent populations, and in order to provide input for the Department's current family impact initiative as well as the upcoming White House Conference on Families, the Division of Asian American Affairs, in collaboration with the National Institute of Education, sponsored on 9-12 March 1978, a conference on "Pacific and Asian American Families and HEW-related Issues." The goal of developing up-to-date information about the impact of HEW programs on PAA families was achieved in an open, frank exchange of information and ideas which reflected the participants' view that no one form of family organization is predominant in the PAA communities; rather, a wide range of diverse, changing family units is being affected in a number of both positive and negative ways by federal policies and programs. As we shall see below, the conference formulated a series of recommendations which reflect the need for policy initiatives as well as changes in existing programs in order to strengthen and protect the different family forms found among the 2.5 million* Americans who trace their heritage to the Pacific-Asian basin.

The purpose of the conference was to address the problems of Asian American families, in order to develop some statements of policy in research and program areas that the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation and the National Institute of Education will be able to use to influence the design and direction of research and policy initiatives in the areas of health, education and welfare, as they relate to questions about PAA families. The conference was limited to a small number of people, knowledgeable about governmental program processes and well known for research relating to PAA families. The expertise and experience of all participants were called upon to develop practical, operational statements about problems inherent or latent in PAA families, to analyze ways in which these problems are or are not addressed in current administration initiatives, and to suggest ways in which these problems may be more appropriately dealt with within the larger sphere of the research and policy-making process.

The conference is only a first step in sensitizing the federal government to PAA problems; beyond that lies the next step of affecting government activity in some of the problem areas articulated by the participants. So, although this conference in and of itself cannot be expected to make major changes in current policy, the information generated by it will be used as a basis on which to begin to effect modification in policies that are shown not to be resposive to the social needs of the PAA population.

---

* This figure is drawn from 1970 Census figures and subsequent immigration data for Pacific Islanders and Asians and does not include any of the Trust Territories.

B. Design, Development and Modification of Conference Agenda

Two considerations primarily influenced the design of the conference agenda. The planning committee attempted to design the conference in a way that would result in the development of cogent statements on the major family-related issues that should be addressed within the context of current HEW policy and program initiatives as well as in HEW's longer-range agenda, while still esteeming the individual interests of conference participants. To the former end, a task group approach was developed to be used in conjunction with a series of general sessions. This approach consisted of dividing participants (according to their preferences) into groups dealing separately with topics in health, education and welfare. For its particular area, each group's duty was to decide upon and rank the three most critical PAA concerns. Then, using a format designed by the planning committee, each group would develop each of its issues into a policy position to be recommended to the appropriate agencies in HEW.

To present the federal perspective to and provide the task groups with a "reality base" from which to judge better the feasibility of their recommendations, The Division of Asian American Affairs (DAAA) developed a list of targets of opportunity. The targets of opportunity are those policy and program initiatives of primary concern to the present administration. They are in various stages of progress; some are now in Congress and others, still under development within HEW. The list compiled by DAAA did not preclude any task group from choosing other issues considered more critical and/or feasible. Further, as another means of providing the groups with both a background of information and a point of reference, apposition or comparison, research papers were prepared and presented by particular conference participants in the area of either health, education, or welfare. (Maxine Hong Kingston was not able to attend the conference to present her paper, "A Family", which gives personal, impressionistic examples of childhood familial events and situations, interwoven with some historical background. However, the paper was distributed to all participants and is included in Appendix B.)

The list of targets of opportunity, the policy position format, and the health, education and welfare research papers served as guides to the task groups and provided the backbone of the conference agenda.

General sessions were to be used to present background papers of a cross-cutting nature, to relay information back and forth among task groups, and to provide participants with occasions to introduce areas of concern or of particular interest. To help ascertain both the nature and intensity of participants' interest in certain selected subject areas, and to obtain suggestions for conference format, a conference questionnaire was sent to writers and discussants, about 50 percent of whom responded prior to the conference. The results were summarized to aid task group leaders in directing and coordinating discussions.

Finally, to help ensure that group suggestions and recommendations have a certain amount of feasibility and potential for effective follow-up strategy, invitations were extended to a variety of individuals from various agencies within HEW and other departments of the federal government, as well as staff members from appropriate congressional offices (see participant list in Appendix A for actual attendees). Also, another reason for bringing together participants from the federal government, the legislative branch, and the academic or private research world, was to try to establish a coalition or network not only for working toward effecting policy and program changes but also to establish permanent channels of communication and information exchange.

The rationale for a strong, structured agenda was to obtain a reasonable number of policy and program recommendations that realistically can work within federal constraints. While not cutting off entirely suggestions for new government programs (some of which might require new legislation), the emphasis of the conference was on timeliness, that is, on getting short-range suggestions that are much more likely to be accomplished than large-scale innovations. However, certain concerns of participants modified the original agenda (in process more than content) once the conference was under way. Participants' concerns generally fell into one of the three following areas:

- First, there was a concern as to the boundaries of their role at the conference; i.e., was that role strictly advisory or did it extend to advocacy with federal agencies? The overall opinion was that a different group should undertake the advocacy role, using as a tool the policy papers put out by participants.

- Second, the participants as a whole felt the need for some kind of foundation of information-sharing and knowledge upon which to begin formulating the different policy papers, and wanted the papers on each of the three content areas to be presented not simultaneously but to the entire group for discussion. This modification was made to the agenda (although papers were not formally presented but summarized generally), so that after these presentations, the task groups individually began their work.

- Third, there were concerns about the use of the policy papers as a final product. One concern centered around the task forces' ability to review any changes or expansions of the papers (since each task group is credited with authorship) before being publicly disseminated as part of this report. This suggestion was, in fact, carried out soon after the conference in order to allow adequate time for review.

The next section summarizes the discussions of the background paper, "Institutional and Social Factors Shaping the Growth of the Asian American Family" and of each of the papers devoted to health, education and welfare (social welfare and economic welfare), respectively. Each paper is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix B.

II. SUMMATION OF PRESENTATIONS OF SPEAKERS AT THE CONFERENCE

This section will concentrate on summarizing the discussions that took place around each of the five research papers presented during the course of the conference, rather than reiterate the content of each paper. Copies of the research papers are included in Appendix B. Presented first is the discussion of a paper which helps to give an overall framework to succeeding discussions through its focus on the evolving nature of different types of Asian American families.

A. Institutional and Social Factors Shaping the Growth of Asian American Families -- Juanita Tamayo Lott*

Although the author intended to relate her remarks to the overall objectives of the HEW-White House Conference, those objectives were not at that time adequately explicit. It should be noted that in contrast to interest articulated by the White House and HEW in the strengthening of the American family, the focus of this paper stresses families. Using personal and participant observation as the basic method, the paper sketches the evolution of different types of Asian American families as a result of the influence of institutional and social factors, summarized below.

Using a table of black family structures adopted from Andrew Billingsley, two types of Asian American families can be identified which fit none of the table's categories yet have evolved due to institutional barriers: communal arrangements and long-distance families. Also evolving from institutional factors are three family arrangements that are modifications of Billingsley's structure: late families, war bride families, and new immigrant families. Briefly listed below are the characteristics of these different families. (See Lott's paper in Appendix B for detailed descriptions.)

- Communal families: A household composed of non-related persons.
- Long-distance families: The household head, traditionally male, works in the U.S. for his family back on the mainland.
- Late families: A great difference in age exists between husband and wife, the former usually considerably older than the latter, who in general immigrated from Asia following WW II.
- War bride families: Families predominantly composed of Asian wives and non-Asian military husbands, the formation of which was precipitated by WW II and has increased with the wars in Korea and Vietnam.

---

* The author, currently an Equal Opportunity Specialist for the Women's Rights Program Unit of the Civil Service Commission, was formerly with DAAA and was heavily involved in the conference's inception.

- New immigrant families: Families immigrating following relaxation of immigration laws. This group includes mainly South Asians, Koreans, Pacific Islanders and Indochinese families in many different structures.

Institutional factors (such as immigration policy, anti-miscegenation laws, anti-ownership policies, non-citizenship status, low socio-economic status) in various combinations with social factors (such as strong work orientation, strong kinship, achievement motivation, role flexibility) have contributed to the growth of Asian American families and their peculiar kinds of arrangements. The contemporary Asian American family seems to be moving toward the simple nuclear family (generally characteristic of the American family), and with the exception of immigration policies, institutional factors are not playing as significant a role as earlier in the history of Asian Americans. It is interesting that the recent immigrant groups, especially Indochinese, show the same types of family structure as did earlier Asian American immigrants, notably an extended family life before beginning one's own family structure.

Looking at the factors influencing the various Asian American family structures, one can draw several conclusions. Little is known about Asian American families because they are so new to the U.S. As new families, Asian Americans have met with many impediments to not only growth but survival, and in order to survive, have developed different structures accordingly, which vary across ethnic groups. Lastly, although Asian American families as a whole have strengths to survive and adapt, they are also fraught with hardships and problems, some of which can be addressed to policy and/or programs of the federal government. Specific policy, program and research recommendations are listed below:

Policy recommendations

1) Recognition and active support of alternative family structures, which might widen the definition of eligibility in individual HEW programs and hence result in expanded service delivery.

2) Analysis of policies affecting family structures. All policies (on taxation, immigration, housing and property, economics, employment, citizenship, etc.) should be analyzed at the federal level and repealed or amended due to discrimination when needed.

Program recommendations

1) Approach service delivery for Asian American families through particular services. (Child care, for example, is at the moment critical for Asian Americans; family counseling services are also needed among the new immigrant, war bride and late families.)

2) Approach service delivery through the targeting of funds for particular programs. (A program for wives of U.S. servicemen has been trying to get funds from DoD and other federal agencies; a longer-range program need might look at the mental health problems that are just starting to be acknowledged among the "successful" second and third generations.)

Research recommendations

1) Develop a more pluralistic framework which can encompass the various definitions of the family (i.e., in terms of households, kin, vertical or horizontal structures, etc.). This recommendation implies ceasing to use only the white American family structure.

2) Collect baseline data on a national level. (Last year, a participant began to examine census data on Asian American families, going back many years. Although the number of males and females was known, lack of any data on marital status or household composition precluded knowing the types of relationships and family structures existing among these people.)

3) Conduct research not only on the different structures of the family but on the functions of each type. This would aid the government in determining its proper functions and responsibilities to the family, particularly in the welfare area.

Highlights of the discussion following the presentation are summarized below.

- Some disagreement was expressed as to whether the nuclear family was indeed becoming the norm for Asian Americans. The following reasons were given:

  - There are indications that families which show up statistically as residential nuclear families might have extended relationships to a far greater degree than the general nuclear family population.

  - South Asian immigrants are entering into various communal arrangements or staying with relatives. (This might be a temporary phenomenon which will change when the immigrant is financially able to establish his/her own home.)

- For the last few years, immigration priorities for Chinese were on the nuclear family (and as a result, most immigrants fell in that category). However, now Chinese immigrants seem to be moving into another phase in which siblings can bring siblings. So it is possible that while the nuclear family presently prevails, after a period of immigration, the extended family will once again emerge (as sister brings sister, etc.).

- There is a need to explore the changing functions of the family and the changing roles of family members (i.e., social institutions -- schools and day care centers -- are assuming an increasingly large role in child rearing), and how the changing roles affect relationships among family members.

- There is a need for studies of the Asian American family from the perspective of traditional Asian culture, instead of only comparative studies of the Asian American and dominant American cultures.

- There is a need for a sizeable Asian family study grant which would cut across all Asian groups and which would be set up institutionally for a 5 or 10 year period. This would allow such a study to have an ongoing impact and would allow a scope of research that few Asian American studies have been able to have because of limited time frames and funds.

B. The Socioeconomic Status of Asian American Families in Five Major SMSA's -- David M. Moulton*

Three component parts comprise the paper, the main goal of which is to try to depict accurately the economic status of particular Asian American population groups. These component parts are:

- An attempt to describe the demographic characteristics of Asian and Pacific Islander ethnicities with some focus on the family,

- An attempt to examine the economic status of this wide and diverse population, and

- An attempt to determine the extent to which HEW programs adversely impact different PAA ethnicities or the Asian American population as a whole.

The demographic characteristics are examined by labor market or metropolitan area. Almost 50 percent of Asians (as opposed to about 14 percent of the white population) are concentrated in four mainland areas: the Los Angeles/

---

* Dr. Amado Y. Cabezas of ASIAN, Inc. (Asian American Service Institute for Assistance to Neighborhoods) presented the paper at the conference. Mr. Moulton is also on the staff of ASIAN, Inc.

Oakland SMSA*, the Los Angeles/Long Beach SMSA, the Chicago SMSA and the New York SMSA. Using mainly the 1970 Census data** to look at the social characteristics and family structure, the author disaggregated data in each of these four SMSAs. The Census data tended to support the notion that at that time, about 80 percent of Asian American families were husband and wife social organizations. The pattern was relatively uniform except in the Chinese families (slightly more prevalent) and Japanese families (slightly less prevalent). About 10 percent of the Asian American population was made up of "unrelated individuals" (Asians not in the nuclear family unit), mostly single elderly individuals. A tabulation was also run which supports the idea that Asians are involved in a greater number of extended family structures than the general population, although not to the extent that the stereotype might suggest.

At this point in the presentation, a discussion ensued as to the usefulness and wisdom of disaggregating data on the Asian American population as a whole, in order to affect government policy. Some arguments against disaggregation are summarized below.

- When the group about which data are gathered for public use wields no power, one should be careful about scrutiny and stratification of those data, as disaggregated data have often been misused and misinterpreted. Data should not be gathered for gathering's sake, nor disaggregated for disaggregation's sake, but rather discriminatingly gathered and studied by the groups for and against which those data will ultimately be used.

- Political liabilities might exist in separating various Asian subgroups. For example, if data show that one subgroup is suffering socioeconomically more than another, there might be a tendency to infer that one group is well off and the other is not (when, in fact, neither may be). It could become a question of political unity vs. possible conflicts among groups which would further weaken Asian American political power.

Samples of the validity of disaggregated data are described briefly in the following paragraphs and at greater length in the paper itself.

Census data reflecting economic status often distort the economic success of the Asian American population. For example, employment data seem to infer that a relatively high percentage of Asian males hold professional jobs. Disaggregation of these data, however, shows the kind of jobs many really are; many so-called managers are self-employed, mostly in retail operations and many in one-man retail operations. Disaggregation shows the number of unpaid relatives employed by the business owner. In addition, it can be seen that for Asian firms without employees (65-90 percent of Asian firms, depending on the SMSA, have no paid employees), the average gross receipts range from about $13,000 to about $23,000 (see Table 11A in Moulton's paper). So it can

---

* Standard metropolitan statistical area.

** Other data augment the Census data; see Moulton's paper in Appendix B for more detailed description.

be seen, that most Asian American "managers" are individual shop owners and should not be compared with other managerial positions; therefore, the employment data are misleading if left aggregated.

An example of disaggregated data refuting a stereotype can be found in the fact that while the stereotype holds that Japanese, especially in the Los Angeles area, by and large hold good jobs, data show that actually 25 percent of the Japanese workers in that area have low-income, low-status jobs. The point is that sometimes hypotheses are pursued indiscriminately, and at the exclusion of other hypotheses (The mistaken hypothesis pursued in the Bakke decision, for example, was "well, the Asians can do it; why can't the other minorities?") Disaggregated data might serve to disprove or at least amend common erroneous assumptions.

Another figure giving the illusion of Asian American success is rate of labor force participation. High labor force participation is used as a measure of success (notably by the Department of Labor) and Asians have a very high participation rate, women especially. However, Asian Americans are concentrated in low-income, low-status jobs and hence can hardly be deemed successful. Related to that illusionary figure are unemployment rates, since Asians tend to be underemployed rather then unemployed.

Income level is also an area which can show Asian families in a misleading way. Although relatively few Asian American families are below the poverty level, such families also tend to have a comparatively large number of earners; actual earnings per member are very low. From an economic standpoint, this means lost opportunities (for further education, the pursuit of other aspects of their lives which might lead to economic betterment, etc.). There are almost certainly other social and psychological detriments incurred by a family with many members working.

Statistics on the level of educational attainment are misleading in terms of the consequences of higher education for the average Asian American. It is true that the proportion of Asians 25 years and older (therefore supposedly out of the educational system) who are college graduates is high compared to the total population. However, it also appears to be true that the returns to well-educated Asian men and women are minimal compared to their white counterparts (see Tables 1[illegible]-C in Moulton's paper). Returns on amount of experience in the labor market are similarly low, as shown in a study by H. Wong at the University of California at Berkeley.

Regarding recommendations to HEW's policy and program agendas, there is first a need to characterize the varieties of Asian families before determining economic status. The next step is then to replace some of the deceptive socioeconomic indicators with ones which will result in an accurate picture of Asian American economic status. Then, perhaps, a matrix (or something similar) could be drawn, running one way the characteristics of those families in need of help, and running the other way the kinds of programs (either existing or to be designed) that can meet their needs. More specific recommendations for further study, as listed at the end of Moulton's paper, are given below.

1. Construction of socioeconomic indicators appropriate for the Asian American population.

2. Characterization of the differences among Asian American groups.

3. Research on the education/work/income relationships for Asians.

4. Research on the motives for selecting career paths by Asians.

5. Research on educational policy for Asians, with regard to both optimum strategies and pertinent academic areas.

6. Study of family income, education, and expenditure patterns.

7. Determination of the cost of 100 percent participation by all eligible Asians in public assistance programs, and measurements of the benefits foregone at lower participation rates.

8. Determination of the public assistance costs if present conditions lead to the increased disintegration of Asian American families.

9. Outreach and education programs to Asians on their eligibility for public assistance benefits.

10. Investigation of cultural identification and acceptance for children with one Asian and one non-Asian parent.

C. Asian American Families -- Harry Kitano*

The main focus of this presentation and discussion pertains to some of the reasons that psychological and social welfare services remain largely unused by Asian Americans. Because of the "model minority" stereotype, it may be believed that the lack of use of services indicates a lack of needs and/or problems among the Asian American population. Cultural insensitivity on the part of many providers is the biggest reason for non-use of services, coupled in some instances with lack of adequate publicity to the Asian community, ineffective organization that leads to fragmentation, lack of bicultural staff, and physical inaccessibility to agencies. Asian Americans by and large do not communicate their needs in the same way as white Americans; the more subtle, non-verbal levels of communication are misunderstood, if not ignored completely, both by the government in designing certain social welfare services and by those actually providing the services. Obviously, an indirect manner of communicating does not meet with great success in trying to penetrate the vast bureaucracy and, thus, needs and cries for help remain unheard.

As amusing but significant anecdote helps to illustrate this point. An Issei doctor practicing in San Francisco had no office, for he knew no one would come. Instead, he walked the streets until someone would say, "Why don't you go see Mrs. X; she hasn't seen you for a long time and would love to chat." Knowing

---

* The author is a professor at the University of California School of Social Work.

this meant she was sick, the doctor would buy a bag of fruit, go to visit the woman, and discuss her children, the weather, and similar topics. However, buried in this mountain of trivia would be a hint of an illness, and buried in the doctor's circumlocutious replies would be a hint of a response. This would continue until a diagnosis was reached. Whether or not HEW can be made sensitive to cultural traits illustrated in the above example is worthy of investigation.

At least one agency in HEW, the Social Security Administration, has had success in modifying the structure of one New York office. The workers there include Chinese, Japanese, Pilipinos and Koreans. The women coming to collect their social security checks like the staff very much and bring them gifts. The staff were not allowed to accept the gifts until it was explained that gifts are a part of the cultural norm and represent no conflict of interest. Perhaps sensitivities such as this can be impressed on other agencies.

Another discussion centered on discrepancies -- at least from the Asian American norms -- in certain federal policies. Most government policy, wittingly or unwittingly, implies and is built around a single norm, and ignores variations that may occur in large segments of the population. The economic policy of income taxation, for example, virtually limits the age of dependents to 21 years or younger, while it is quite common for Japanese children to live as dependents until age 25 or 26. Housing policies, too, seem to be built on the norm of the nuclear family and exclude a considerable number of Asian American families. Asian American powerlessness might be the biggest reason that much existing government policy does not take into account this segment of the population. Asians in positions of power -- either within the government or in an influential position outside -- are needed to participate in policy-making decisions. There is also powerlessness on the part of researchers, whose data ultimately may or may not influence policy making. The caution was reiterated, in connection with this lack of power, to consider carefully the purposes for and amounts of data gathered, since the groups in power have rarely used data to Asian American advantage in the past.

Social welfare recommendations made at the conference included:

- Appropriate publicity of some programs, via ethnic newspapers, local TV stations (such as a station in Los Angeles which runs Asian programs), and local community resources;
- Adequate research funding to build a solid base of empirical data on the Asian American population;
- Funding of some service facilities (e.g., day care, community health clinics) that Asians can run themselves; and
- A project comparing apparently successful programs (i.e., with large numbers of Asians using them) with failures, in order to determine the variables for success.

D. Public Policy Responses to Public Health Needs of Pacific/Asian American Families -- Jerry L. Weaver*

The presentation primarily dealt with conclusions or policy related issues of the paper, but was prefaced by the following remarks. First, with regard to the question of the value associated with highly disaggregated data, without it, a tremendous challenge would be posed in trying to develop health programs that are tailor-made to the needs of the various subgroups. As the paper shows, many epidemiological indicators are very communal specific; health problems differ significantly among subgroups. As one broad policy initiative for all Asian Americans would be inadequate, one set of data used for the group as a whole would be just as inadequate. Second, because of the rapidly growing and changing Asian American and Pacific Islander communities (with the exception of the Japanese community which is not changing in the sense that no essentially new groups are emerging), health indicators and statistics used five years ago are very suspect now.

Acculturation is the device used in the paper to analyze different age cohorts (elderly, middle-aged, adolescents and children) and different communal health problems associated with each. Pages B-123 to B-140 of Appendix B discuss these cohorts and health problems in detail.

The group discussion revolved primarily around two topics. First, out of a suggestion to use Asian physicians to provide health services to the elderly (since the elderly are often only marginally acculturated), grew a discussion of the role of the Asian American health professional in the health care field. If licensure laws could be changed to reduce the amount of red tape involved in the licensing of foreign born and trained physicians, then expanded service delivery to the Asian American community could be not only more rapidly but probably more effectively accomplished. Presently, for example, the Chicago area supposedly has a large number of PAA health professionals but income data suggest that they are not working in the health care field (or at least not at the professional level), since the average annual per capita income is $6,000.

In the nursing profession, seniority or tenure is not transferable from one hospital to another so there is a calculated policy in many hospitals, designed to cut costs, of turning nurses over as they approach high pay scales. The labor pool from which many new recruits are drawn is the very highly skilled Asian/Pacific Islander health professional. For the same economic reasons, many foreign medical graduates (FMGs) in the mental health field are in the state hospitals. The second largest group in the American Psychiatric Association is the Asian psychiatrists (1200 out of 27,000). In the State of New York, 41 Korean psychiatrists out of 44 are in state mental health hospitals -- by and large private practice remains inaccessible to them, so they remain underutilized.

Another aspect of the underutilization of Asian physicians is the question of limited licensure. That is, there is a clear and present need for improvement of health care delivery to the Asian American community. Therefore, should

---

* The author is a Professor at the School of Government and Public Administration, American University.

state and federal licensing boards be encouraged to allow some of the FMGs to practice in order to begin to serve the unique needs of the community? Such licensure would certainly imply a hierarchy of discrimination and second class medicine. The concensus of the group was that even given the pressing need for attention to the health care problems of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, the limited licensure compromise should not be made.

The other main area of discussion was nutrition education and its importance in a pluralistic society. There may be severe risks for one population to use a diet system that reflects someone else's norms. While a unicultural diet should not be imposed on every segment of the U.S. population, nutrition education on the potential hazards or diseases that specific subcultural diets may produce should still be carried on. Evidence shows, for example, in Japanese and Chinese there exists a high association between stomach problems and certain site-specific cancers and the consumption of certain foods (pickled foods and dairy products). School systems should be able to provide this kind of education and should be able to take into account culturally accepted foods and eating habits.

Other examples of specific recommendations articulated include:

- Curriculum revision and reform in the public schools, to offset "ham and egg imperialism" which dictates one set of cultural models. From the models presented by the schools and mass media come much stress and distorted self-image. These potential mental health problems could be warded off by more cultural realism on the part of schools and media.

- Expansion of alternate health delivery systems (in order to overcome some of the economic barriers to health care) such as HMOs and multi-cultural day care centers.

- Investigation of a community-based clinic system with community participation as both administrator and provider. There is a model for this in the Cuban system.

E. Education and the Asian American Family -- Bob H. Suzuki*

The examination of what schools can do to help strengthen the Asian American family was conducted through a conceptual framework of three major influences that shape and direct the family. The three influences are:

- Cultural background: Subculture values, beliefs, behavior patterns, family structure, relationships childrearing practices, kinship systems, etc.

---

* The author is Associate Professor in the School of Education, University of Massachusetts in Amherst and pursues his research and teaching interests in the area of multicultural education and Asian American studies.

- Social historical forces: Effects on individual and family of the larger social system and its various institutions (not only government agencies, for example, but various historical movements).

- Biosocial development: Maturation level of the individual or group and the ways in which that level affects their adjustment and response to the two other influences. (For example: the effects of internment camps were very different for the Issei and the Nisei.)

Before describing some of the ways in which the above influences impact on the family, it must be noted that this conceptual framework has little predictive value. At best, the framework could be used to try to project what might happen in the future to affect the Asian American family while always acknowledging the possibility of having to modify our programs or policies drastically, if social historical events prove the concept wrong.

Although the discussion examined primarily the interaction between school and family, there are numerous other influences which interact with one another and should be kept in mind. First, a generalized list of Asian American family characteristics is presented, followed by an overview of the development of the public school system and how it has modified these characteristics.

The list of characteristics presented below is based primarily on Japanese and Chinese Americans, although some will apply to Pilipino families. Subtle but basic differences between Japanese and Chinese cultures (due to generation, time of immigration, regional variation and socioeconomic status, etc.) are ignored and instead, the gross values and patterns of the "model" Asian American family are studied. It should be remembered that all of these values can be either strengths or weaknesses, if carried to one extreme or the other, within the context of contemporary American society.

Cultural Values

- Group over individual interests, sensitivity to feelings and views of others
- Self discipline and motivation for hard work
- Respect and care for the elderly
- Great reliance on non-verbal communication
- High value placed on education
- Flexibility and harmony; adaptation and adjustment to situations

Family Structure and Relationships

- Close, affective nuturing of the young
- Relatively strict discipline of children
- Use of shame to control behavior of children
- False dependency between members
- Great reliance on non-verbal communication
- Extended family relationships
- Strong ethnic community ties
- Interdependent relationships between groups and organizations

Public education began on a large scale in the U.S. in the mid-1800s when elementary education began to be implemented in various parts of the country. Public elementary education was fairly universal by the late 1800s and was a forerunner of the present large, consolidated school districts. Much of this consolidation was justified on the basis of efficiency and brought about such changes as standardization of curriculum and teacher certification which in turn set the pattern for uniformity in the educational system. Along with the development of secondary public education, a host of innovations was initiated around the turn of the century: junior high schools, vocational schools, IQ tests -- all of which were again justified on the basis of efficiency. These innovations culminated in the large urban school districts controlled by centralized boards with a great deal of power to determine policies and practices.

In the 1960s, this concentration of power within large districts became an issue, particularly for minority children who were not faring well in this system. The culture-of-poverty explanation was used initially, giving rise to a reexamination of the traditional interpretation that the educational system arose almost "accidentally." The revisionist interpretation maintains that the large, consolidated, compulsory, free educational systems were developed rather systematically by people in power, who used the system as a tool to socialize working-class children to fit into the industrial, corporate state that was developing in the mid-1800s. The development of a bureaucratic structure that allows centralization of control and standardization of curriculum and teaching methods may be regarded as the reason for the pervasiveness of Anglo American conformity in the school system.

The revisionist interpretation, in turn, led to a reevaluation of the relationship between schooling and mobility. The basis of justification for IQ and achievement tests was the long-held theory that education was primarily responsible for social mobility in the U.S. Through IQ and achievement testing, those students with innate intellectual ability could be identified and sent on for additional schooling in order to acquire superior cognitive skills and hence, higher paying jobs. Recently, however, a book published by two economists from the University of Massachusetts (Samuel Bowles and Herb Gintis) indicates that income is a very weak function of childhood IQ level or the level of cognitive skills of an individual. On the other hand, income is a strong function of socioeconomic background and years of schooling. The interpretation of the seemingly incongruous notion that income is a function of years of schooling but not cognitive skills is this: cognitive skills are important in order to get a job, but are produced in far greater abundance than necessary, either in schools or on the job.

Income does depend largely on noncognitive traits; that socioeconomic background is important is not surprising, but why are years of schooling important if not to develop cognitive skills? The answer may be that years of schooling perform primarily a socialization function, and determine many noncognitive factors such as type and number of credentials, mode of dress, mode of speech and behavioral patterns. Although many factors other than education account for the present economic and social status of Asian Americans, the point is that schools have had their primary impact on the family through socialization. Is this socialization the reason why economic returns do not adequately reflect the fact that Asian Americans on the whole are so highly educated?

Several factors may be responsible for Asians being one of the most highly educated ethnic groups in the U.S. Traditional values, combined with the fact that education was virtually the only avenue open for social advancement, account in part. Additionally, Asian Americans were barred from many unions and so could not hold many blue-collar jobs. But they also were also excluded from many white businesses and so became entrepreneurs in their own self-sufficient communities. Many families hoped that education would give their children more opportunities but at the same time, realized that racism imposed certain limits on what their children would be allowed to do. Therefore, many parents encouraged their children to pursue technical and scientific areas (this in turn was a cause and effect of inadequate development of verbal English skills). The enormous expansion of the bureaucratic and technological sectors of the U.S. economy following WW II led to some access to white collar jobs by many Asian Americans because of the nature of their training. However, it may well be true that since gaining access to "lower echelon white collar positions," Asian Americans have remained stratified there and have not risen in significant number to upper level adminsitrative and management positions.

Some of the effects of schools on the Asian American family include the tendency of some students to become more individualistic with regard to certain traditional cultural values as a result of the socialization process. With regard to family structure and relationships, schools tend in certain ways to reinforce negative aspects of socialization in the family (passivity

and an unquestioning attitude, for example). The greater permissiveness in many middle class schools has greatly affected childrearing practices and consequently, has resulted in a loss of some of the shame children might have been brought up with traditionally. On the other hand, entry of children in large urban schools led in some ways to an estrangement of the children from the family, thereby affecting kinship and community relations. There is often a lack of involvement in the schools on the part of the parents, especially for the immigrant generation, which apparently contributes to the deterioration of ethnic ties that some students might have had with the community.

Research, program, and strategy recommendations arising from the foregoing observations are:

- Further refinement of studies impacting the Asian American community, especially studies on the usefulness of schooling (if not to develop cognitive skills) in being successful in the U.S. socioeconomic system.

- Examination of the seeming stratification of Asian Americans in mid-level jobs. Examination into the reasons some Asians refuse to deal with the political aspects of job mobility (i.e., because of lack of social and political skills or because of a refusal to compromise themselves).

- Promotion of organized efforts as a mechanism for action -- group action over individual action is perhaps more of an Asian tendency and should be encouraged.

- Development of increased awareness to the true nature of wealth and power, so that Asian Americans will not fall into the "civil servant" mentality and believe that a few thousand dollars more a year in salary make a significant difference in power.

Broad recommendations for education policy as related to Asian Americans are:

- Any program to strengthen Pacific/Asian American families through education should be approached cautiously to ensure it does not adversely interfere with the structure and function of these families, and should be flexible enough to be modified or eliminated if social historical unfolding events prove that the program is based on incorrect assumptions or projections.

- Schools should be made more accessible to the Pacific/Asian American population by reducing their bureaucratic structure and centralized authority.

- Programs must be designed to ameliorate family/school discontinuities which seriously undermine the structure of the family.

- All educational programs should adopt pluralistic approaches which recognize diversities in the cultural, familial backgrounds of Pacific/Asian American families.

- Schools must devise ways in which Asian American parents can participate in school decision making and the education of their children.

III. TASK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The core of the conference consisted of the three task groups on health, education and welfare, respectively. The purpose of these groups, as explained in the first section, was to choose three areas that affect the quality of Asian American family life in relation to health, education or welfare. In the process of explaining the purpose and procedures of the task groups, DAAA advised the conferees to choose these areas of concern, keeping in mind an element of feasibility, in terms of the likelihood of effective federal government action for each area selected. This advice was aided by the presentation of a list of targets of opportunity (the major policy and program initiatives of relevance to Pacific Islander and Asian American families) in order to help orient the groups toward recommendations that might have the greatest chance of being implemented. It should be noted, however, that the groups were free to choose any area for action that they deemed critical.

Working from a format developed prior to the conference, each group developed written statements for each area of priority to be used as an input to policy making processes or bodies within HEW. After formulating a ranking of issues and initial recommendations, each task group presented issues (and recommendations addressing them) to the conference as a whole. In some cases (examples of which are given below), discussion by the group as a whole led to modification of some of the issues and/or recommendations.

Also discussed briefly in the following paragraphs are the processes used by each of the three task groups to determine and rank the problems most critical to the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities, along with exmaples of other issues considered important by the task groups but which are not among the top priorities. The remainder of this section then presents the work accomplished by each group over the 4-day period.

The Health Task Group began its deliberations by listing all of the health problems and needs of PAA communities which might be affected by HEW programs. Each member of the group was encouraged to express as wide a range of issues as possible. This process generated a list of approximately 25 potential issues. Next, the group considered the severity or priority of each issue according to the age cohorts or generational strata of each community. Thus, group members thought about hypertension and high blood pressure education as an issue for the elderly, middle-aged, young adults, and children of the Japanese, Chinese, Pilipino and other communities. After reviewing each issue in this manner, it became clear that while some issues were of particular salience to this or that element of the PAA population, approximately 7 issues were of major or critical concern to the widest number of individuals. In order to establish priority among the issues, each member of the group scored three top concerns: 3 points for first, 2 points for second place, and 1 point for third place. After this preliminary ranking, it was decided to give the members of the group a few hours to consider the collective priorities; interestingly, this initial scoring was unanimously accepted and is reflected in the Health Policy Paper.

The Education Task Group identified six broad subject areas of concern to PAAs; in some cases, these cut across the targets of opportunity (see Appendix A). The areas were:

1. Adult Education
2. Bilingual Education
3. Multicultural Education
4. Higher Education
5. Career Education (Awareness and Counseling)
6. Nontraditional Education

Through a process of elimination, the first three areas were chosen as target issues, although Higher Education was eliminated only in the interest of keeping within the prescribed number of areas. In addition to the target issues for Education, the Education Task Group made two general recommendations: 1) more evaluation research in Education, and 2) more Asian American and Pacific Islander representation in the various education agencies in the federal government. The group's choices resulted from a dialectic among members, with group discussions followed by informal votes for accepting and setting priority of issues.

The Education Task Group's recommendations evoked more controversy than either of the other two components of HEW, probably because the subject of education involves a high degree of emotion and personal opinion, touching as it does on such very important questions as socialization, personal identity, etc. Summarized below are highlights from a discussion that took place in a plenary session. The argument basically focused on whether the bilingual education policy position supported by the conference was a transitional or maintenance model.

- The transitional model holds a child should be given bilingual education (i.e., taught subject content in two languages, English and native) for a certain number of years, until the child learns English sufficiently well to function totally in English at his/her own grade level. The child then enters the mainstream, or English-speaking, educational system. The transitional model is a process which has as its goal English competency.

- The maintenance model aims at retaining proficiency in both English and the native language throughout schooling, without having English predominate. This model is a more recent innovation in bilingual education than the above model.

- The definition of bilingual education according to federal law uses the terms in reference to people who do not speak English. The law proposes and encourages the learning of English through a dual language program. (Thus, teaching an English-speaking Korean child to speak Korean is not a part of bilingual education, according to federal law.)

- Some participants wondered why certain elements of bilingual education, such as 1) teaching majority groups ethnic languages, and 2) teaching predominantly English-speaking Pacific Islanders/ Asian Americans the language of their ancestors, were not included in the task group's original recommendations. Others stressed that the interpretation of bilingual education should be in accordance with federal law interpretations, and that priority should be given to the needs of the very large immigrant population.

- Some participants regarded a kind of forced assimilation as the goal of the transitional model of bilingual education, since the measure of a student's success was his/her incorporation into mainstream education. However, others held that English proficiency is the goal, and meeting the goal does not automatically assume that a person is working toward the values of the dominant society (as evidenced in part by the participants themselves--many of whom spoke predominantly English but were nonetheless devoting themselves to the topics undertaken at the conference).

The above issues were resolved through group discussion and agreement, and appropriate modifications made before the final paper was produced. As evidenced in the Education Policy Paper, bilingual education program recommendations included the following elements of both the transitional and maintenance models:

- English competency as a goal;

- The ability of predominantly English-speaking PAAs to study their ethnic languages; and

- The ability of non-Asian groups to study Asian languages.

The Welfare Task Group also used a primarily dialectical process to determine the areas of highest concern to Pacific Islander/Asian American communities. Some members of the group expressed misgivings about their ability to fulfill their charge within the time constraints; others were concerned that their choices of and recommendations for critical areas would effect no changes in federal government decision making. Finally, after the procedures were agreed upon, the group selected four of the various topic areas to be included in the Welfare Policy Paper. Following the policy paper format, the group selected the programs pertinent to each topic and recommendations on programs, research, and legislation were made. Finally, the topics were put in order of priority; however, it was emphasized that the ranking was almost arbitrary because of the small difference in degree of importance among the critical issues/areas.

The Welfare Task Group chose as priority issues dependent populations, new immigrants, access to services, and welfare services for U.S. Trust Territories, all of which are discussed more fully in the Policy Paper at the end of this section. Some highlights of the group's discussion are given below.

The Welfare Task Group chose one priority issue, dependent populations and their need for better care. Included in that population are children and the need for improved day care. While this could not be elaborated in the body of the paper, group discussion of day care included the following observations:

- Community-run day care centers (such as some Korean communities have tried to start) would preserve the ethnic dimension for its children and could provide a forum for parents to share questions and ideas. On the other hand, chances of success might be greater and more feasible by using existing channels instead of pushing for the development of new, independent programs. Two of the existing channels could be:

  - Good existing day care centers, which might be encouraged to incorporate ethnic Asian perspectives (via Asian employees to teach the culture), and

  - Public day care centers organized through an existing mechanism, such as the public school system.

- There is a need to find out how lack of child care centers contributes (directly or indirectly) to child neglect or abuse cases, in order to better argue for adequate PAA day care facilities.

- How can day care centers be set up so as to achieve the proper equilibrium in serving the needs of both children and parents?

The Welfare Task Group's presentation of their policy paper to the conference as a whole prompted such questions as:

- Why were problems of Pacific Islander/Asian American women not included in any topic areas, since PAA women suffer a dual discrimination (from the dominant society and often from PAA males as well)? Respondents pointed out that women were included under the top priority issue, Dependent Populations. Being limited to such a small number of critical issues dictated that targeted populations be as wide as possible.

- Cannot the fostering of PAA economic self-determination be encouraged? Some participants pointed out that this is somewhat outside the realm of HEW programs, since welfare does not foster self-sufficiency but merely provides a minimum level of subsistence. However, recommendations can be made to amend the nature of traditional HEW welfare policy.

Following are the three policy papers developed by the conference participants. These lay out in a systematic way the priority issues and recommendations of the task groups in program, research and legislation areas. At the conclusion of each policy paper is a list of possible action steps that could lead to implementation of some of the recommendations.

Conference on Pacific and

Asian American Families and

HEW-related Issues

March 9-12, 1978

HEALTH TASK GROUP

POLICY PAPER

Task Group Members

Jerry Weaver, Group Leader

Ford Kuramoto

Walter Martindale

Pat Okura

Tin My Thein

Kim Dung Tran

Conference on Pacific and Asian
American Families and HEW-related Issues

Health Task Group Policy Paper

I. Issue: Developing Health Resources for the Underserved

II. Agencies: Bureau of Community Health Services
National Institute of Mental Health
National Cancer Institute
Health Care Financing Administration
National Institute of Health
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
Health Services Administration
Health Resources Administration
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration
Social Security Administration
Office of Human Development Services

III. Statement of Problem: Pacific and Asian American (PAA) families face particular health problems. One of the most severe is the number of barriers there are to obtaining the full range of services needed. These barriers to utilization include (1) absence of bicultural personnel/providers; (2) high cost of services; (3) inaccessible programs in community health and mental health; (4) the absence of culturally relevant treatment techniques; (5) insensitive handling of clients from intake onward; (6) lack of services for particular target groups such as partners in international marriages and the elderly.

IV. Recommendations:

For the Federal Government:

A. Programs: there are a number of federal programs which could be more responsive to the special needs of PAA families. For example, revision of PL 94-484 in terms of impact on PAA foreign medical graduates, and making PAA personnel available to the PAA communities.

Examples of other federal health services which could be more responsive include: CMHC, CAC, HUD, Medicare and Medicaid, and Mental Health Extension Care, e.g., day treatment.

B. Research: must be undertaken in the following areas so that better programs can be designed:

1. bicultural care v. non-bicultural care
2. home care v. institutional care
3. research and development of pilot projects and alternative health delivery models

C. Legislation: is needed to expand the range of delivery systems in several areas, including:

1. HMOs
2. Nonfamilial services ranging from a room in a private dwelling through subsidized apartments with only minimal services to full time multiprofessional care of the type provided in convalescent hospitals and nursing homes. Some of the desired reforms may be accomplished by revision of the Medicare program.
3. Extension care for general health, e.g. day treatment.

For PAA communities:

A. Programs: Programs which communities and ethnic groups can undertake to help facilitate utilization include:

1. self-help groups, co-ops, peer counseling, rap groups, etc.
2. reinforcement of natural supportive networks around health care.
3. formation of group insurance plans.
4. initiation and expansion of community education efforts through vernacular media.
5. scholarship programs for health care providers.
6. support of efforts by ethnic studies programs to conduct remedial and investigative projects such as health fairs.
7. support of efforts to recruit PAA providers and staff who are sensitive to the needs or preferences of PAA peoples.
8. community support of efforts by ethnic heritage and cultural programs.

V. Action Steps:

A. Volunteer follow-up with federal agencies.

B. Volunteer follow-up with Congressional members and staff.

C. Identify key committee and subcommittee staff.

D. Identify and contact relevant "constituency groups" and other "allies".

E. Identify and contact relevant "constituency groups" and other "allies" in PAA communities.

F. Work to gain the support of PAA caucuses in health organizations and workers associations such as ANA, APHA, APA.

G. Contact funding bodies.

H. Identify, contact and learn from others such as the AFL-CIO.

I. Issue: Health Education

II. Agencies: Same as above

III. Problems: there is a severe need to alert PAA communities to existing health care threats. Among the top priority areas there are hypertension, substance abuse and education for accessing delivery systems.

IV. Recommendations:

For Federal Agencies:

A. Programs: the staff of DAAA is asked to review existing legislation and programs concerned with step III above for the purpose of identifying gaps or services opportunities which the PAA communities can use.

B. Research: review research programs and priorities so that the needs and concerns of PAA peoples will be met by existing activities.

C. Legislation: identify problems not now adequately dealt with and develop appropriate initiatives.

For PAAs: Same as previous issue, step IV.

V. Action Steps:

A. Seek the help of State and local government agencies.

B. Encourage the media to provide health education and build support for PAA health needs.

C. Plus previous issue, step V.

I. Issue: Basic and Applied Research to Clarify Health Problems and to Develop Remedies

II. Agencies: Same as above

III. Problems:

A. The three top priorities, in descending order of significance are:

1. need for research into the psychological and emotional problems of PAAs and possible remedies.

2. ethnocultural specific problems such as hyperuremia in Pilipinos and lactose intolerance in PAAs.

3. disaggregation of health statistics and defining more sensitive measures of community health so that a clearer picture of the morbidity and mortality profiles of PAAs may be seen.

B. Other urgent problems which need more research evidence include:

1. cancer

2. specific problems of cohorts and communities, e.g., drug abuse among youth and environmental health of Chinatowns.

IV. Recommendations:

For Federal Agencies:

A. Programs: more research support focused on PAAs through block grants.

B. Research:

1. research into different means of securing greater local participation in the design, administration, and evaluation of programs.

2. research centers in locales of interest such as Guam.

3. establishment of a National Center on Asian and Pacific American Affairs.

4. research should be done by appropriate PAA and other scholars sensitive to the needs of PAAs and able to provide effective research methods.

C. Legislation:

1. support Inouye's bill to create a Minority Division in ADAMHA.

2. DAAA staff should review existing legislation to identify gaps and target areas for legislative initiatives and new research efforts.

For PAA Communities:

A. Programs: get informed about current research activities, information, and implications.

V. Action Steps:

A. Same as issue above, Step V.

B. Help build greater constituency support through local, State, and National "Networking" conferences.

C. DAAA should take the lead in securing support for one or more seminar/workshops in each of the three areas of Health, Education, and Welfare at which specific programmatic and legislative initiatives can be drafted. Membership in these conferences should be a mix of technical/subject experts, policy planners, and agency personnel from the relevant fields.

Conference on Pacific and
Asian American Families
and HEW-related Issues
March 9-12, 1978

EDUCATION TASK GROUP

POLICY PAPER

Task Group Members

Bob Suzuki, Group Leader

Bob Chin

Iwao Ishino

Ben Junasa

Stanford Lyman

Kaz Oshiki

Betty Lee Sung

Steve Thom

Preamble: Pacific and Asian American (PAA) families have generally placed a high value on education and, as a group, PAA's have one of the highest educational levels of any ethnic group in the U.S. However, the schools today are not meeting many critical needs of PAA students and, indeed, may be the source of many of the serious problems currently being faced by PAA families.

Issues: After considering a large number of targets of opportunity, the task group on education decided that the following issues should be given highest priority:

1. Adult Educatio
2. Bilingual/Bi ion
3. Multicul

Policy statements f presented on the pages to follow.

I. Issue: Adult E

II. Agencies: Office of Education, National Institute of Education, Department of Labor, Small Business Administration and Community Services Administration

III. Statement of the Problem:

Adult education, in this section, speaks mainly to the large number of recent immigrants who seek gainful employment immediately upon arrival, yet urgently need to learn a new language and a new vocation. They have neither the time nor the luxury to attend regular classes. Under such circumstances, they may be confined to low-paying, dead end or traditional ghettoized jobs, thereby limiting their options and chances for upward mobility.

Teenagers among immigrants find it difficult to keep up with their school work, and because of language barriers, often drop out of the regular school program. At the same time, they find it difficult to find satisfactory jobs because they lack a high school diploma and cannot speak English. Their future is bleak and they may join the street gangs whose criminal activities have terrorized Pacific Islander and Asian American communities throughout the country.

Finally, another group that needs adult education is the Pacific and Asian wives and former wives of U.S. servicemen who must adjust to a new lifestyle in the United States. They often find it necessary to seek work to help support their families, but do not have the formal training to obtain meaningful jobs.

IV. Recommendations:

A. Programs:

1. An integrated English language and vocational education program with support services in job placement and family counseling for the following groups:

   (a) Teenage school dropouts
   (b) Women
   (c) Immigrants
   (d) Underemployed and undereducated.

2. A program to coordinate the above educational activities between various educational and social service agencies at State and local levels.

3. A program to provide educational aid to approved immigrants, (those who have been) approved for entry, but who are waiting for a quota position to open. Since these potential immigrants may wait as long as nine months, they can use this time to prepare themselves for life in the United States. The delivery of this adult educational service might be made by the United States Information Service (USIS).

B. Research:

1. Some research must be undertaken to find cost-effective ways of teaching vocational and language skills to selected PAA groups -- the search for cultural factors in learning is an important dimension here.

2. Research should also be undertaken to test whether the above-mentioned adult programs are best channeled through existing educational institutions and associated curricular formats or through new educational technology utilizing special FM broadcasts, cable television or educational satellites to reach students in nontraditional learning environments.

C. Legislation:

1. Determine whether or not new legislation is required to provide U.S. funds for the training of new immigrants who are waiting for entry into the U.S. (see IV, A, 3).

2. For existing legislation that authorizes and funds adult educational programs, determine if it is necessary to amend by inserting the term "immigrant" for such groups to qualify for benefits.

I. Issue: Bilingual/Bicultural Education

II. Agencies: Office of Education, National Institute of Education, Department of Labor, National Institute of Mental Health

III. Statement of the Problem:

The Pacific and Asian American population is a very diverse one encompassing many ethnic and national groups as well as generational ones. Recognition is taken of the fact that the needs of each of these groups are different. Bilingual/bicultural education is necessary for all. However, priority should be given to certain target populations within the larger PAA peoples, namely the recent immigrants.

Over 50% of the PAA peoples are recent immigrants and in some subgroups like the Vietnamese, virtually all of the members are recent arrivals to this country. Many of these newcomers are non-English speaking. The lack of English competency affects their employment opportunities, may alienate the students from pursuing their education, and may contribute to an increase in juvenile delinquency. The existing educational programs do not speak to the special needs of these immigrants.

Note is also taken of the fact that many American-born PAA's are not provided with the opportunity to learn the language and cultural values of their immigrant parents, which widens the generation gap and contributes to the lack of communication within PAA families.

In this multi-cultural society, opportunity should be afforded non-PAA students to learn and come to appreciate the language/cultures of PAA peoples.

On-going and existing bilingual/bicultural programs must be evaluated for their effectiveness. Information is also needed about how bilingual/bicultural programs and desegregation efforts impact one another.

IV. Recommendations:

A. Programs:

1. The bilingual/bicultural programs developed must relate more closely to the world of work and perhaps be targeted to vocational education.

2. The program should assist the students in their transition to English competency.

3. New approaches should be developed to increase the rapidity and effectiveness with which students learn to use English.

4. Curriculum materials in bilingual/bicultural education must be developed.

5. Training programs should be set up to increase the number of qualified bilingual/bicultural teachers and to prepare them for certification.

6. The programs should try to involve the family unit as a whole in the educational process.

7. The bilingual/bicultural programs may also serve to help American-born PAAs maintain their cultural identities through the learning of their ancestral languages and cultures.

B. Research:

1. Research is needed to determine whether existing programs are meeting the prospective goals of bilingual/bicultural education which are:

   (a) to provide PAA students with the language and cognitive skills to compete successfully in the dominant society

   (b) to provide them with the opportunity to retain and strengthen their community's heritage and cultures

2. Research is needed to determine the effects of desegregation on bilingual/bicultural education and vice versa.

C. Legislation:

1. Since the larger number of PAA peoples are recent immigrants, many do not meet the residence requirements of five years or more for citizenship -- they are therefore cut off from bilingual/bicultural teaching jobs. At the same time, these people may be the ones most qualified in terms of language and cultural competency for the jobs. The realities of the situation are that few American citizens are fluent in languages such as Korean or Vietnamese. Legislation is needed at the State level to be able to certify these non-citizens to teach in bilingual/bicultural education classes.

2. Explore possible joint funding or other linkages between the Department of Labor and education programs under the Youth Training Development Act.

D. Action Steps:

1. Congressional hearings on Bilingual/Bicultural Education to be held on March 15th -- Contact Congressman Norman Mineto.

I. Issue: Multicultural Education

II. Agencies: OE, NIE, NIMH, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, Office of Human Development Services

III. Statement of the Problem:

Due to the Anglo-centric orientation of most American schools, PAA students often undergo traumatic family/school discontinuities, leading them to denigrate their own subculture, parents, and self-concepts. Teachers are often quite insensitive to the problems, needs and learning styles of PAA students. Moreover, the curriculum either completely ignores PAAs or misrepresents and stereotypes them. Such biases in schools contribute not only to conflicts in PAA families, but also to the perpetuation of racism, sexism, and inter-ethnic conflict with American society. Indirectly, they also deleteriously affect relationships between Pacific/Asian countries and the United States.

Multicultural education (MCE) has been conceived as an educational approach that would assist in alleviating these problems. It is designed to help reduce family/school discontinuities, depolarize conflicts between ethnic groups, and increase students' understanding of the causes of racism, sexism and poverty. Unfortunately, present conceptualizations of MCE are often ill-defined and have conflicting purposes and priorities. Consequently, there is considerable confusion and misdirection in the field.

IV. Recommendations:

A. Programs:

1. Educational programs teaching basic skills should incorporate multicultural approaches which employ curriculum materials on PAAs and teaching methods appropriate to the learning styles of PAA students.

2. Much broader efforts are needed in inservice training of teachers to help them develop the necessary skills, knowledge and attitudes to more effectively meet the needs, both academic and social, of PAA students.

3. Crosscultural materials on PAAs should be developed through such programs as ESAA, Teacher Corps, and Bilingual Education for use in schools throughout the country.

4. Much greater emphasis should be given to MCE in all Federal educational programs.

5. Multicultural curriculum materials on PAAs should be more widely and effectively disseminated to broaden their use in the schools.

6. Programs to serve PAAs should be developed through the Senior Centers Program of the NEH.

B. Research:

1. R & D is needed to improve conceptualizations of MCE.

2. Evaluation of on-going MCE programs is needed to delineate the factors that enhance or hinder the effectiveness of the program.

3. Research is needed to determine the causes of cultural conflicts among PAA students, both in the family and at school, and ways of alleviating them.

4. R & D in in-service training methods for teachers is needed to determine ways of increasing effectiveness in meeting the needs of PAA students.

C. Legislation:

1. The appropriation of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program should be substantially increased to broaden and step up development of MCE programs. This program should be placed within the National Endowment for the Arts.

2 Sizeable appropriations should be reinstated for International Education Programs.

V. Action Steps:

The following suggestions may be taken in order to facilitate implementation of specific program recommendations for all three issues.

A. Congressional Action:

1. Present PAA bilingual education recommendations at the Congressional Hearings on Bilingual Education Programs through a coalition of PAAs and Hispanic Americans.

2. Brief members of Congress on the PAA recommendations including the probable amendments to existing laws which would include "Pacific/Asian Americans" as special beneficiary group.

3. Explore the possibility of Senator Spark Matsunaga reintroducing the "Gateway Cities" bill which would provide Federal assistance to cities and States impacted by immigrants.

B. HEW Administration:

1. Identify PAA members in various advisory committees of HEW agencies for their review and support of the recommendations.

2. Identify qualified persons of PAA background for possible nominations to various advisory boards and committees in the federal system.

C. Pacific/Asian Communities:

1. Disseminate copies of conference proceedings to the PAA community for their review, comments and support of the recommendations.

2. Develop informal network among PAA organizations for a possible formation of a cohesive and organized coalition for common concerns.

3. Encourage grantsmanship training for PAA's interested in writing project proposals.

Conference on Pacific and Asian

American Families and

HEW-related Issues

March 9-12, 1978

SOCIAL WELFARE TASK GROUP

POLICY PAPER

Task Group Members

Bok-Lim Kim, Group Leader

Amado Cabezas

Tino Calabia

Sharon Fujii

Harry Kitano

Juanita Tamayo Lott

Gwen Wong

Walter Wong

Introduction

The deliberations of the Welfare Task Group have been guided by two basic assumptions:

> First, given that the theme of this conference is the strengthening of American families, we, as members of Pacific and Asian American (PAA) families take the position that, wherever possible, family and community-based care must be given priority over institutional care, particularly as reflected in current social welfare programs.
>
> Second, given that traditional welfare policy is directed at minimum survival rather than self-sufficiency, the response of this task group is in part reactive, geared to short-range, symptomatic changes in existing policy. However, we have also attempted to provide a proactive long-range response in recognition of social welfare as the social and economic well-being of members of society.

The issues we have surfaced for action by HEW -- dependent populations, new immigrants and access to service -- and the subsequent actions to be undertaken by HEW, are of a general nature. Recognizing the complexity of existing legislation and programs as they bear on the welfare of PAA peoples, we recommend that the staff of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation and the Director of the National Institute of Education initiate and coordinate the analysis of these laws and regulations so that future programs may be designed to provide more effective coverage for PAA communities.

Among the programs which should be examined are:

- Title XVIII of the Social Security Act, Medicare, vis-a-vis the elderly
- Title XIX of the Social Security Act, Medicaid, vis-a-vis dependent groups
- Children and Youth Programs of the Office of Human Development Services
- Programs of the Administration on Aging, the National Institute on Aging and the National Institute on Mental Health as they impact on elderly Pacific and Asian Americans
- Welfare Reform Package

I. Issue: Dependent Populations (including children, aged, handicapped, the economically and socially disadvantaged, women, and special groups of children)

II. Agencies:

1. Office of Human Development Services

2. Health Care Financing Administration

3. Social Security Administration

4. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation

III. Statement of the Problem:

Alternative models of care are needed. Presently there are disincentives for PAA families to care for their dependent members in existing legislation and in the regulations defining eligibility. PAAs need better access to services.

Both caretakers and dependents suffer because of the eligibility criteria which have been established for the existing programs. Care and service needs of the PAA population are not being adequately met.

IV. Recommendations:

A. Programs:

1. Use tax incentives and third-party payments in the delivery of welfare services.

2. In child care, develop demonstration projects to test optional modes of child care, including:

a. Reimbursement to relatives or friends for child care
b. Day care
c. Tax incentives
d. Working parents.

B. Research:

1. Conduct long-range research to:

a. Analyze the types of social units (organizations) developing in PAA communities.

b. Develop better indicators of economic and social well-being in PAA communities.

2. To identify gaps in services:

   a. Identify at risk dependent groups for whom programs need to be targeted.

   b. Identify programs designed to meet the needs of the population.

   c. Compare 1 and 2 and identify the gaps.

   d. Pursue appropriate remedies including more research, advocacy and legislation.

3. Explore different tax incentive and third party payment options for compatibility with PAA concerns.

4. Investigate further the impact of existing welfare systems (for example: AFDC, SSI, and Food Stamps) and refine issues based on the findings. Include analysis of filing unit options (units within the household that are separately eligible for benefits).

C. Legislation:

Systematically examine existing legislation, regulations, and administrative data to determine changes needed to facilitate PAA participation in benefits.

I. Issue: New Immigrants

II. Agencies:

1. Office of Human Development Services

2. Office of Education

3. Health Care Financing Administration

4. Social Security Administration

5. Immigration and Naturalization Service

6. Department of Labor

III. Statement of the Problem:

Fully a third of all PAAs are new immigrants. The initial adjustment and settlement needs of this population have been neither recognized by nor reflected in Federal programs. Failure to recognize and resolve these short-term transitional problems immediately, however, can result in immigrants having problems that are long-term and more difficult and costly to remedy.

IV. Recommendations:

For Federal Agencies:

A. Programs:

Establish an interagency task force comprised of the Office of Human Development Services, the Office of Education, the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Department of Labor, on the welfare of new immigrants.

B. Research:

Demonstrate and evaluate the effectiveness of comprehensive, multi-service centers for immigrants.

C. Legislation:

Modify income maintenance eligibility criteria so that immigrants who are not yet citizens will be eligible for benefits.

For Pacific Islanders and Asian Americans:

A. Legislation:

1. Monitor Federal, State and local welfare and social services legislation to identify proposals to limit eligibility based upon citizenship or resident status. Form coalitions with Hispanic groups to do this monitoring.

2. Explore and support legislation to provide additional funds to States and cities for services to new immigrants (e.g. "Gateways" bill).

3. Advocate for recommendation IV, C above.

I. Issue: Access to Services

II. Agencies: HEW-wide, Congress

III. Statement of the Problem:

Although PAAs may be eligible, many factors impede their access to programs, including lack of information about services and the small number of PAAs in the total population which puts PAAs at a disadvantage in competing for formula and categorical grant programs.

IV. Recommendations:

For Federal Agencies:

A. Programs:

1. Resources for PAA populations must be allocated on the basis of social justice in which a fair share is only a minimum. Social justice for disadvantaged hard-to-reach populations may require compensatory assistance which in dollar amounts exceeds the group's proportion in the total population. Activities that will assure that Asian client groups have mechanisms to access the service delivery systems must be encouraged.

2. In programs for areas where funds can be targeted (programs in areas of population concentration), special "set asides" for PAAs should be made available.

3. Contracting with PAA vendors (service deliverers) must be encouraged.

4. Federal government has the responsibility to highlight and sensitize their own officials and their State, county and local grantees to the social justice issues of PAAs. PAAs must be equitably represented in decision-making positions, staff positions, advisory councils and program review committees. Asian participation in State-level planning groups (e.g. Title XX State planning committees) must be increased.

B. Research:

1. Identify and demonstrate the effectiveness of informal resources indigenous to ethnic communities, which function as intermediaries for access to services and programs (e.g. Korean churches).

2. Document more fully through research and evaluation, the lack of PAA access to social welfare planning, benefits and services.

C. Legislation:

1. Legislation to mandate set asides for PAAs.

2. Legislation to support and encourage informal community-based resources facilitating access to services and programs.

3. Legislation to mandate PAA representation on State planning committees.

For Pacific Islanders and Asian Americans:

A. Advocate for set asides for PAAs.

B. Develop networks so that PAA candidates can be identified and supported for decision making and advisory positions. Encourage PAAs to work in Federal, State and local government at all levels.

C. Convene a conference of PAA human service providers especially in the social welfare areas to share programmatic and funding strategies, to transfer technologies in service delivery, and to develop a mutual assistance network.

I. Issue: Extension of Welfare Programs to U.S. Territories in the Pacific

II. Agencies: HEW, Congress

III. Statement of the Problem:

The welfare of Guam, the Mariana Islands, American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is the responsibility of the U.S. Government. Yet appropriations for social security benefits, welfare benefits, and social services are not extended to these areas as they are to the States.

IV. Recommendations:

A. Programs:

1. Establish welfare offices in American Samoa and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and extend benefits to these areas.

B. Legislation:

1. Support legislation being written to extend benefits to Guam and the Mariana Islands in the same manner that it is extended to the States.

2. Develop legislation specifically to appropriate funds to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in the same manner.

3. Monitor future bills to make sure assistance to these areas is not overlooked.

ADDENDUM: Conference Planning Recommendation: To better preapre participants for developing comprehensive recommendations in the social welfare area, background materials and a description of the assignments should be distributed in advance of the conference.

IV. PROPOSED ACTION STEPS

The long-term consequences of the Conference on Pacific/Asian American Families are, at the writing of this report, still to be seen. The Division of Asian American Affairs is hopeful that the conference will serve in part as the basis for a sustained and everwidening sphere of influence (sustained and widened by continuing follow-up efforts) for the Asian American and Pacific Islander communities, which can be used to effect changes in HEW policy and programs that will correctly reflect and meet PAA needs. With this goal in mind, a preliminary list of possible action steps was recommended by some or all of the participants at the conference. These recommendations are discussed in the following paragraphs, as well as some suggestions from DAAA to Pacific Islander and Asian American communities at large.

The first item listed was recommended and approved by the group as a whole. It concerns a series of letters about the conference (why it occured, what was accomplished, and implications it may have), to be written by participants on a group or individual basis, except as noted below:

- Letter to Secretary Califano (this was drafted and sent by the group on March 24, 1978).
- Letter to the community and individuals (to be done by participants on an individual basis).
- Letters to the White House Conference on Families staff (to be done by participants, Congressional staff, community organizations and individual community members).
- Letter from Secretary Califano to White House Conference on Families staff.
- Press release concerning White House Conference on Families. This is to be done by participants and released to the PAA community.

The second series of action steps came out of the conference but were not recommendations from the entire group. Although these steps were originally directed at participants for individual consideration, any interested member or organization of the PAA community is urged to think on pursuing these steps and establish contact with DAAA (see the end of this section for more information). Action steps for participants and the community to consider are:

- Written specification (to DAAA) of individual actions to be undertaken as conference follow-up. Coordination by DAAA of these activities will help avoid unnecessary

overlaps or duplications and will help reveal gaps where more activity is needed.

- Mailing lists from different organizations should be coordinated in order to maximize the number of individuals reached by any one effort.

- Teams should be formed in each of the content areas of health, education and welfare. The teams should be comprised of one representative from the federal government, a lead person, other individuals from each of the task groups, and community representatives. These teams would develop their own strategies for follow-up meetings with relevant agency heads, politically-oriented individuals and groups, and others. Within each team, small groups need to be formed to examine the issues systematically in greater detail.

- Information should be shared among individuals, communities, and DAAA via memos or another form of regular feedback. Relevant news regarding events that have transpired since the conference should be disseminated.

- PAA advocacy units in Washington, D.C., could be a mechanism for follow-up of some of the issues raised at the conference. Participants should support the existing efforts by PAA community groups, including the Pacific/Asian Coalition (PAC), Asian/Pacific American Federal Employee Council (APAFEC), Organization of Chinese Americans (OCA), and Japanese American Citizen's League (JACL), to set up and/or staff Washington, D.C., advocacy offices. Anyone who so wishes and is able to do so should provide financial support to such organizations. (Since the conference, several participants have donated their honoraria to PAC to help establish a Washington office for advocacy.)

- Follow-up conferences should be held which address each of the content areas of health, education, and welfare, not necessarily in the context of the family but more broadly. Such conferences could include, for example, bureaucrats, politicians, community representatives and professionals.

- Discuss possibilities for follow-up with PAC and other national organizations and inquire whether they would like to assume partial responsibility for follow-up activities.

The third action step is an appeal by DAAA, to participants, members of the community and organizations, for assistance in indentifying and establishing a network of persons/organizations interested in the issues raised at the conference. By sending lists of people/organizations with whom the task force papers should be shared, DAAA can then write each person or group

to ask if the issues are appropriate to their interests and if they would like to become involved in such related activities as review of proposed bills, comments on items published in the Federal Register, participation in constituent group hearings on policy issues, and participation in follow-up conferences. The lists should specify whether the person or organization is interested primarily in health, education, welfare, or civil rights issues, and should be sent to the address given below. The Division of Asian American Affairs urges contribution by anyone interested in establishing a network of communication, information exchange and action on issues of importance to the PAA population. Finally, any comments, inquiries, suggestions, ideas, proposals or advice pertaining to any issue raised at the conference or any other issue pertinent to the overall well-being of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, are actively solicited by DAAA and should be addressed to:

The Division of Asian American Affairs
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Room 419-E, Hubert H. Humphrey Building
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201
Phone: (202) 245-7371

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Targets of Opportunity

List of Participants

LIST OF TARGETS OF OPPORTUNITY

Health

Development of Health Resources in Underserved Areas

Preventive Health Care

Alcohol, Drug Abuse, Mental Health

National Health Insurance

Teenage Pregnancy

Child Health Care

Education

Grants for Disadvantaged

Education for all Handicapped Children

Desegregation Assistance (Emergency School Aid Act - Title IV of Civil Rights Act)

Bilingual Education

Adult Education

Vocational Education

Higher Education

- student assistance
- supplemental opportunity grants
- college work study
- institutional assistance
- developing institutions

Welfare (Social Services and Income Maintenance)

Child Welfare and Foster Care

Programs for the Aging

Day Care and Child Development Services

Programs for Youth

Title XX - General Social Services

Family Violence

Deinstitutionalization

Social Security Benefits

Welfare Reform

Civil Rights

CONFERENCE ON PACIFIC AND ASIAN AMERICAN AFFAIRS
AND OTHER HEW-RELATED ISSUES

Sponsored by:

The Division for Asian American Affairs, HEW
The National Institute of Education, HEW

March 9-12, 1978

Airlie House

* *

List of Participants

Dr. Amado Cabezas
ASIAN, Inc.
1610 Bush Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

Mr. Tino Calabia
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
1121 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Room 400
Washington, D.C. 20425

Dr. Bob Chin
15 Blake Street
Belmont, MA 02178

Mr. Martin Chong
4700 Davenport Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Ms. Connie Downey
Department of HEW
Room 424E, Hubert H. Humphrey Bldg.
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dr. Sharon M. Fujii
Pacific/Asian Elderly Research Project
2400 S. Western Avenue #206
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Ms. Gladys Hardy
Deputy Director
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W., Room 700
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dr. Iwao Ishino
103 Center for International Programs
Institute for Comparative & Area Studies
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

Mr. Ben Junasa
State Immigrant Services Center
1164 Bishop Street, Suite 614
Honolulu, HI 96813

Professor Bok-Lim Kim
School of Social Work
University of Illinois
1207 West Oregon Street
Urbana, IL 61801

Ms. Maxine Hong Kingston
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii *

Dr. Harry Kitano
School of Social Work
405 Hilgard Avenue
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Larry Kubota
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W., Room 803
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dr. Ford Kuramoto
County of Los Angeles
Department of Health Services
1401 Chestnut Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90813

Ms. Juanita Tamayo Lott
U. S. Commission on Civil Rights
Room 410-C
1121 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20524

* will not be present but her paper will be delivered at the conference.

Professor Stanford Lyman, Chairman
Department of Sociology
New School of Social Research
65 5th Avenue
New York, New York 10003

Mr. Walter Martindale
Department of State Agency
for Interntional Development
Room 3317
Washington, D.C. 20523

Mr. Pat Okura
National Institute of Mental Health
Parklawn Building, Room 17C-10
Rockville, MD 20582

Mr. Kaz Oshiki
c/o Congressman Robert W. Kastenmeier
2232 Rayburn Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Ms. Canta Pian
Division for Asian American
Affairs, HEW
Hubert H. Humphrey Bldg., Room 419E
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dr. Betty Lee Sung
City College of New York
New York,New York

Mr. Bob Suzuki
East West Center
Cultural Learning Institute
1777 East West Road
Honolulu, HI 96848

Dr. Tin My Thein
Universal Research Corporation
17422 Matinal Drive
San Diego, CA 92127

Mr. Steve Thom
Office of Education
Asian and Pacific American
Concerns Staff
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 4027
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Kim Dung Tran
IndoChinese Refugee Task Force
Donohoe Building
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20207

Dr.Jerry Weaver
2909 South Buchanan
Arlington, VA 22206

Ms. Gwen Wong
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Room S-3313
Washington, D.C. 20210

Mr. Walter Wong
School of Public Policy
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720

Ms. Janie Young
Division for Asian American
Affairs, HEW
Hubert H. Humphrey Bldg., Room 419E
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

APPENDIX B

Research Papers Presented at the Conference

INSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS SHAPING THE GROWTH OF ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

JUANITA TAMAYO LOTT
DECEMBER 1977

Working paper prepared for Conference on Pacific and Asian American Families and HEW-related Issues. Not to be quoted or cited without permission of author.

PREFACE

I cannot even show you
the house I first lived in
When I came to this place
When I was two years old

It was the first floor of an ugly-blue-gray-two-story-flat
On Laguna Street between Bush and Sutter
It was in that marginal neighborhood
Which demarcates the poor blacks of the Fillmore from the
powerful whites of Pacific Heights

We lived -- my mother, my father, my sister, and I
We lived in a one bedroom flat
We lived in the living room
Two elderly Pilipino men, relatives of my mother, lived in
the bedroom
And all of us shared the kitchen and bathroom.

I remember some good moments in that old kitchen
With bare bulbs hanging from a high ceiling
When friends came for dinner and everyone talked and laughed
But I also remember my mother weeping silently
Over the kitchen sink
Tears falling down her cheek and on to
Her big belly carrying my brother
And I new even at four that she wished we had our own flat

My mother's wish came true
And the old flat remained a few more years
To house someone else's tears and smiles

And one day, not too long ago
When I was walking along the demarcation line,
I stopped and turned on Laguna Street to visit that old flat
But it was no logner there

In its place was a vacant lot and a sign about urban renewal,

1 February 76
Juanitamayo Lott

Current interest in families has thus far neglected the role of racial minority families and their contribution to a general understanding of American families. Little data exist on these families and most of these data focus on the deviance of racial minority families from the norm of white middle-class American families. There is a lack both in social science research and policy analysis of more encompassing, pluralistic, theoretical frameworks within which to view families. Because of this lack, which results in an inadequate and thus inaccurate understanding of American families, it is particularly useful and essential to examine the factors that have shaped racial minority families. Moreover, although they have historically been deterred from forming, racial minority families have developed, sustained and increased.

This essay will be limited to an examination of lesser known racial minority families, Asian Americans. We will focus primarily on the Japanese, Chinese and Pilipino American families, the larger and older Asian American families. We will examine how Asian American families developed, how they adapt and how they grow.* In essence, this essay attempts to describe the evolution of Asian American families in terms of institutional and social factors which have shaped their existence.

---

* This discussion is limited to the mainland since Hawaii was not a part of the United States during the development of Asian American families in the states. Moreover, the evolution of Asian American families in Hawaii was significantly different from the mainland evolution.

Families have always existed through a variety of structures over time and space. The peopling of the United States by immigrants from all over the world attests to this variety. Twelve different family structures identified by Billingsley in his classic study of Black families reinforce the conceptualization of families as a variety of structures through which the needs of family members and the demands of society attempt to be met (Billingsley, 1968).

BLACK FAMILY STRUCTURE

Types of Family	Household Head		Other Household Members		
	Husband and Wife	Single Parent	Children	Other Relatives	Non Relatives
Nuclear Families					
I. Incipient Nuclear Family	X				
II. Simple Nuclear Family	X		X		
III. Attenuated Nuclear Family		X	X		
Extended Families					
IV. Incipient Extended Family	X			X	
V. Simple Extended Family	X		X	X	
VI. Attenuated Extended Family		X	X	X	
Augmented Families					
VII. Incipient Augmented Family	X				X
VIII. Incipient Extended Augmented Family	X			X	X
IX. Nuclear Augmented Family	X		X		X
X. Nuclear Extended Augmented Family	X		X	X	X
XI. Attenuated Augmented Family		X	X		X
XII. Attenuated Extended Augmented Family		X	X	X	X

Adapted from Black Families in White America: By Andrew Billingsley

In the following examination of the evolution of Asian American families, we find the presence of such structures and modifications to them. Further, other structures are identified that have emerged in order that Asian American families could better survive.

While institutional factors have in part determined both the ability of Asian American families to develop as well as the direction of their development, it must be kept in mind that the early Asian Americans themselves influenced the timing and type of families they created. Social expectations and attitudes, in combination with outside factors, contributed to the emergence of Asian American families and the structures they assumed.

INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

The immigration patterns of Asians to the U. S. are a major influence in the development of Asian American families.

Immigration history shows that individuals seeking to improve their personal and familial economic status have initially migrated to most countries without their families. The early immigrants left Asia with expectations that they would be economically successful and return home to share their success with their families.*

These expectations were not totally inconsistent with American immigration policy toward Asians at the turn of the twentieth century, which was directed

---

* In later years, these expectations have been modified so that rather than returning to the homeland the immigrants send for their families to join them in the states.

to temporary importation of cheap labor -- specifically manual labor for the industrialization of the West Coast (McWilliams, 1964). Moreover, this policy was basically exclusionary, allowing only a certain segment of Asians to migrate and restricting all other segments. Thus, the initial migration of the Chinese, Japanese and Pilipinos consisted mainly of young, physically able males (Lyman, 1970; Lasker, 1931).

This fact is borne out by census data for the respective immigration periods of these three groups. (Refer to Table A and B on the following pages.)

Throughout the early decades of the twentieth century, immigration policy affected the development of Asian American families and perpetuated a predominantly male population through such action as:*

1882: The Chinese Exclusion Act

1884: Federal court ruling to exclude the immigration of wives of Chinese laborers

1907: Executive Order 589 commonly known as the Gentlemen's Agreement between the United States and Japan to exclude Japanese and Korean laborers.

1917: Act of 1917 to bar Asian immigrants from parts of China, all of India, Burma, Siam, the Malay states, Asiatic Russia and the Polynesian and East Indian Islands.

1924: Omnibus Act of 1924 excluding further immigration by aliens ineligible for citizenship (i.e., anyone who was not a free white person or a person of African descent)

---

* Due to their status as 'nationals' of the United States prior to Philippine independence in 1946, the Pilipinos were not covered by the above policies. However, quota systems were established for the Commonwealth of the Philippines which had a similar restrictive effect on Pilipino migration to the U. S.

TABLE A

Asian Americans in the U.S. (excluding Hawaii) by sex and decade

JAPANESE	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
Males	X	47	134	1780	23,341	63,070	72,707	88,771	71,967	76,467	224,332	271,453
Females	X	8	14	259	985	9,087	38,303	57,063	54,980	64,918	243,838	316,871
CHINESE												
Males	33,149	58,633	100,686	103,620	85,341	66,856	53,891	59,802	57,389	76,725	135,430	226,733
Females	1,784	4,566	4,779	3,868	4,522	4,675	7,740	15,152	20,115	40,415	100,654	204,850
PILIPINOS												
Males	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	22,363	39,723	46,101	114,179	183,175
Females	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	2,051	5,840	15,535	67,435	154,556

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census

TABLE B

Percentage of Asian American Populations Who
Were Single During the Years 1890 to 1970

YEAR	Japanese Males	Japanese Females	Chinese Males	Chinese Females	Pilipino Males	Pilipino Females
1970 *	33.8%	21.8%	38.2%	29.6%	32.5%	29.4%
1960 *	34.1%	21.1%	35.1%	22.0%	40.3%	27.7%
1950	41.8%	30.2%	36.9%	28.2%	47.3%	23.8%
1940 **	51.6%	40.5%	43.9%	33.4%	72.1%	22.8%
1930 **	39.9%	15.2%	48.7%	23.3%	79.6%	18.8%
1920 **	42.5%	6.6%	46.4%	21.8%	82.3%	26.4%
1910 **	70.5%	13.7%	53.3%	23.0%	72.7%	4/9
1900 **	77.7%	48.3%	58.6%	24.3%	N.A.	N.A.
1890 **	86.7%	65.6%	69.0%	32.3%	N.A.	N.A.

* includes Hawaii
** includes ages 15 and over (from 1950 on data includes ages 14 and over)

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census

The predominance of males in the population has been greatest among the Pilipinos. Although this sex disparity has decreased over time, males in 1970 still composed more than half the Pilipino population. Not unexpectedly, the development of Pilipino families in the U. S. is relatively late.

To a lesser extent, the dominance of males is reflected in the Chinese population. The significant formation of Chinese families in the U.S. was a decade or two earlier than the Pilipinos (Sung, 1967).

In contrast, the Japanese population exhibited male dominance only in the first decades of settlement. Among the three Asian American groups, they were the first to develop families, as reflected by the emergence of a second generation in the 1920's and 1930's (Strong, 1934).

Unfortunately, marital status of these groups was not available in the earlier censuses so that the relationship of demographic characteristics to family formation and structure cannot be examined directly. However, it can be assumed that not all the young men who immigrated from Asia were single. In the Chinese immigrant group, up to half were married (Lyman, 1970 b). Although the immigrants were physically separated from immediate kin, familial ties were not necessarily severed nor familial needs diminished. Rather, the married Chinese, Japanese, and Pilipinos along with their unmarried counterparts sought to satisfy their familial needs and to sustain a strong kinship through several alternatives. Alternatives could be grouped around two prevailing attitudes: one which assumed a temporary stay and another which assumed permanent residence in the United States.

The first attitude resulted in such alternatives as delaying familial gratification till one's return to Asia, limiting familial gratification to one's intermittent visits to Asia before final return, seeking some or all familial gratification within formal and informal community organizations, and/or seeking some or all familial gratification in the larger society. Since their participation in the larger society was severely limited, Asian American immigrants continued to look to their kin and fellow immigrants as primary reference groups.

The second attitude resulted in such alternatives as married men sending for their wives to join them, single men marrying Asian wives who would come and join them (e.g., "picture brides" from Japan) or married men and single men marrying Asian or non-Asian women already in the United States.

As inadequate and/or unsatisfying as some of these alternatives might have been (Bulosan, 1943), they were not easily available. Most of the alternatives required substantial financial resources not readily attainable by low wage earners.

While immigration policies all but excluded Asian wives, state antimiscegenation laws prohibited marriages to white and Hispanic women in the U.S., further deterring the formation of Asian American families. Marriage between whites and non-whites was prohibited by law in thirty-nine states. In fourteen states, Arizona, California, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia and Wyoming, Mongolians, that is, Asians, were singled out as ineligible to mary whites (Lyman, 1970 b).

A third bar to the settlement of Asian American families was restrictions against owning property. While their low wages already limited the ability of Asian American laborers to own property, institutional acts such as the 1913 Alien Land Law of California all but guaranteed that Asian Americans could not become property owners. This law provided for Japanese aliens to lease agricultural land for a maximum of only three years, with the stipulation that land already owned or leased could not be bequested.

"An alien denied the right to citizenship, denied the right to own or lease land, and finding himself under continuous harassment, would think twice before investing hard-earned money in land that might be taken away from him at any time." (Kitano, 1976)

The institutional factors of immigration policies, anti-miscegenation laws, and property laws, coupled with the low economic status and mobility of these early Asian Americans, limited or delayed the formation of some family structures but encouraged the formation of new alternatives.

ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILY STRUCTURES: MODIFICATIONS AND ALTERNATIVES

Family structures as characterized by Billingsley, with household heads and other household members, did not exist for a majority of Pilipinos, about half of the Chinese and for a sizable minority of Japanese. In both rural and urban households, these Asian Americans lived in communal situations, sometimes with kin, but oftentimes with non-relatives (Bloch, 1930: Lyman, 1970a). The prevalence of non-related households was accompanied by reliance on community

organizations. These organizations ranged from total social control and support systems such as the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (Lyman, 1970 c), to socializing and acculturating organizations such as the Japanese Association of America (Lyman, 1970 c), to social organizations such as the Caballeros de Dimas Alang (Morales, 1974).

The arrangement of households composed of non-related individuals supported by community organizations can be viewed as a viable family structure for Asian Americans. It was not only a prevalent arrangement, particularly during times of economic depression, but it was an exclusive arrangement for many individuals. For many Asians in America, communal arrangements were the only family life they knew. In many cases, roomates, fellow immigrants from the same town or region, were addressed as kin, thus reinforcing a sense of kinship. Furthermore, the sense of community from these communal arrangements reinforced the broad Asian concept of family as a structure which extended across time and space.* This concept included not only immediate household kin but also one's ancestors, one's descendants, and one's relatives in other households whether they were one or ten thousand miles away.

A second alternative structure found in the Asian American population was one notable of but not exclusive to the Chinese. This structure applied to those immigrants who had families in Asia but were the nominal heads of their households. While these long distance families were condoned and supported by social organizations both in Asia and the United States, the

---

* This understanding of family to extend across space between countries of origin and destination is also found among other immigrants, most recently Carribean immigrants (Bryce-Laporte, 1977).

full growth of these families was retarded. Children grew up not knowing their fathers. Siblings were several years, sometimes decades, apart, depending how often their fathers were able to return home.

Husbands and wives spent a good deal of their lives separate from each other with reunification sometimes awkard if not painful (Kingston, 1975).

In spite of institutional factors deterring more traditional family structures, such structures, notably simple nuclear families and simple extended families, did exist on a small scale in the early Asian American generation. Of the three groups, only the Japanese were significantly successful at forming nuclear families immediately. Unlike the Chinese and Pilipinos, a large number of Japanese initially intended to settle permanently in the United States and they were able to bring enough wives to ensure a second generation before immigration policies barred their further entry (Kitano, 1976). The formation of the second generation in the Chinese and Pilipino populations, however, occurred much later and was very dependent upon 1) the entry of Asian women to the U. S. during relaxation of immigration policies following World War II and 2) the common law and legal marriages of Asian American men to non Asian American women.*

---

* In his forthcoming book on the second generation Pilipinos, Frederic Cordova, University of Washington, submits that the non-Pilipino wives of Pilipino men played a crucial role in encouraging and preserving Pilipino family life and customs.

Two particular family arrangements arose subsequent to the post World War II immigration of Asian women. One was the creation of late families (Collins and Yee, 1972). Many of the Asian women who arrived during this period were much younger than their immigrant generation men. In these simple nuclear families, tremendous age differences (sometimes one generation) existed between husband and wife. Subsequently, the age differences between father and child paralleled the difference between grandfather and grandchild. Late families still flourish in rural Asian American families, particularly Pilipino families. The needs and problems of such families have only recently been recognized, as the rates of young widows with young children increase and as the generation gap widens.

The other type of family arrangement was directly precipitated by World War II, war bride families. These families are composed primarily of Asian wives and non Asian military husbands. This particular nuclear family group has increased with the continuing U. S. wars in Asia. Present estimates for these families number over 100,000 (B.L. Kim, 1975 a). As for late families, existing data suggest a significant number of single-female headed households among war-bride families. However, unlike the widows of late families, most of the war brides heading their households are separated or divorced. Moreover, as interracial families, they potentially experience a more difficult time in establishing themselves as Asian American families.

The late families and war bride families are modifications of nuclear families. They are not alternative structures like the communal arrangements or long

distance families. After World War II the tendency for Asian Americans has been towards nuclear family structures. Again, institutional factors contributed to this tendency. In the post war era, Asian Americans were no longer bound by anti-miscegenation laws, they could become citizens, they could become property owners, and they could be found in a range of socio-economic statuses. As nuclear families, Asian American families are undergoing similar, if not the same, positive and negative experiences that nuclear families in general are experiencing.

SOCIAL FACTORS

Institutional factors alone did not shape the formation or direction of Asian American families. The expectations, attitude and organization of the early immigrants also influenced the growth of their families. These social factors or survival skills included strong kinship, strong work orientation, flexibility of family roles and strong achievement motivation. These factors have been identified as strengths in studies of other families (Hill, 1971; Billingsley, 1968). Unfortunately, Asian American families have yet to be studied systematically so we can only speculate on the presence and importance of these social factors in the growth of Asian American families. However, the manifestations of these factors may be seen as unique adaptations of survival in an anti-Asian environment.

The early Asian Americans migrated with a well-developed sense of kinship, particularly since a main reason for migration was the economic survival of their families. Furthermore, the establishment of community organizations, both formal and informal, was a constant reminder and affirmation of the

immigrant's identity as a kin and community member. This strong sense of kinship served as a basic impetus for creating Asian American families in the face of institutional barriers.

Another social factor contributing to the growth of Asian American families was a strong work orientation. The rural poverty of many of the early immigrants provided them with the necessary discipline to endure the long and laborious work of agriculture and extract industries. Later, as they moved into the urban areas, Asian Americans continued to provide manual services which required many hours of work with low pay.

They persevered in their jobs at first to support their families in Asia and later to support their spouses and children in the U.S. This work orientation, described as similar to the Protestant Ethic (Peterson, 1971), was transmitted to second generation Asian Americans, many of whom grew up working in family stores, laundries, restaurants etc., as necessary cheap or free labor (Nee, 1976). Even today, new immigrants such as the Koreans operate their small business with family members providing substantial labor and other support (Bonacich, Light and Wong, 1976).

While work in the U.S. initially separated the Asian Americans immigrant from their parental family, it oftentimes required the close, prolonged presence of their conjugal family. The stereotype of Asian American families as well knit and stable families in part stems from the latter situation. However, as the younger generation of Asian Americans have been allowed employment opportunities beyond their immediate families, they have left their parents' home to start their own households.

As strong kinship ties and a disciplined work orientation were basic to the growth of Asian American families, strong achievement motivation and role flexibility were also necessary to facilitate the growth of Asian American families.

The early immigrants were expected to achieve. Achievement in many cases meant the difference between starvation and survival not only for themselves as individuals but for their dependent families left behind in Asia. As Asian Americans participate more fully in American society, achievement motivation has extended beyond the expectations of the family. Today, achievement motivation persists through the younger generation and the new immigrants in terms of high educational attainment.

Given the limited family structures available to them as well as their few numbers in the population, flexibility of roles was essential to the survival of Asian American families. In the rural areas women worked alongside men, while in the cities small family businesses were the responsibility of all family members. There was no clear cut division of work and family roles. For many nuclear and extended families, place of work and place of residence were the same.

With respect to child care, the first precious few Asian American children belonged not only to their families but to the entire community. While immediate kin may have been unavailable to perform the functions of grandparents, etc., neighbors and more distantly related kin provided such roles. Moreover, while their parents worked, siblings played with and took care of each other.

Role flexibility was consistent with not only improving one's chance for survival but also with the Asian view of placing the common good before the individual's. Rather than being a rigid and exclusive role, the role of the individual is seen in terms of its benefit for the group and thus must be flexible.

As Asian Americans engage in more age-, sex- and employment-segregated activities of contemporary American society, however, their familial roles have become less flexible and have assumed the more rigidly defined roles of the nuclear middle class American family.

ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILIES TODAY

Contemporary institutional and social factors are supportive of nuclear family structures, which are the most prevalent family structures for Asian Americans. Immigration policies continue to impact on family structures of Asian Americans today even if only on a temporary basis. The 1965 Amendment of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975 have greatly increased the numbers of Asian Americans in a relatively short period of time. The absorption of this tremendous number has in turn resulted in makeshift extended family structures with a portion of new immigrants residing with and being partly or completely supported by relatives and friends until they become self-sufficient (B.L. Kim, 1975). Even now the new immigrants -- South Asians, Koreans, Pacific Islanders and Indochinese -- are experiencing changes in their family structures similar to the earlier immigrants. Many migrate as individuals, with their families remaining in Asia. For others, the new immigration has

resulted in the reunification of families. After the initial assistance by relatives, the new immigrants are left on their own. At times, both husband and wife must work long hours to support their families. Unlike the earlier generation of Asian Americans, place of work and place of residence are two different places for many of the new immigrants. Under these conditions, parents are not able to provide adequate child care nor guidance to their children in adjusting to their new life. The family structure becomes shaky and family life deteriorates. The media coverage of youth gang problems of Asian Americans in recent years is a reflection of the turmoil that some Asia American family structures are presently encountering.

Any discussion of factors influencing the formation and growth of Asian American families would be incomplete without some mention of the 1942 Executive Order 9066 which provided for the evacuation and internment of 110,000 West Coast Japanese Americans. The literature of the camp experience does not pay primary attention to the maintenance or disintegration of Japanese American families. Yet, the authority of these families to maintain their normal functions and responsibilities was superseded by camp authority. While some families were reunited in the internment and relocation centers, others were equally disrupted with family members being sent to different camps. The generation gap widened as Issei (first generation) clung to old ways and Nisei (second generation) tried desperately to assimilate into American society (Houston, 1973). Unfortunately, there is a lack of analyzable family-related data for this period and it is difficult to assess fully both the positive and negative impact of the camp experience on Japanese American families and Asian American families generally (Morishima, 1973).

SUMMARY

1. In summary, the institutional factors of immigration policies, anti-miscegenation laws, anti-ownership policies, non-citizenship status and low socio-economic status shaped the formation of Asian American families either by hindering or delaying their establishment. They also contributed to the creation of at least two alternative family structures, namely communal arrangements and long distance families.

2. Social factors such as strong kinship, strong work orientation, achievement motivation and role flexibility are offered along with institutional factors as also shaping Asian American families. As survival skills, these factors allowed Asian American families to grow despite institutional barriers.

3. Institutional factors, particularly immigration policies, have continued to influence the existence and growth of Asian American families as they move toward the American norm of simple nuclear families. Today, immigration policies have a bearing on established Asian American families and the family structures of the new immigrants as the latter initially become members of the former household and then move on to set up their own family structures.

4. Asian American families are relatively new and have encountered many impediments to their development. Today, they approximate the American standard of nuclear families and exhibit the characteristics of families in general (Pian, 1974). Additionally, they exhibit pressures in those family arrangements, namely late families, war bride families and new immigrant families, that are results of various institutional barriers, particularly immigration policies.

5. The full impact of World War II on Japanese American families and other Asian American families remains to be examined by researchers and policy analysts.

REFERENCES

1. Billingsley, Andrew. 1968. Black Families in White America. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

2. Bloch, Louis. 1930. Filipino Immigration into California. San Francisco: Special Bulletin #5, State of California, Department of Industrial Relations.

3. Bryce Laporte, Roy. 1976. "The New Immigrants: Their Origin, Visibility and Challenge to the American Public--Impact of the Immigration Act of 1965". draft, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

4. Bonacich, Edna, Ivan Light and Charles Wong. 1976. "Small Business among Koreans in Los Angeles". pp. 437-449 in Emma Gee (ed) Counterpoint: Perspectives on Asian Americans, Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center, UCLA.

5. Bulosan, Carlos. 1943. America is in the Heart: A Personal History. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

6. Collins, Bill and Donna Yee. 1972. Social Forces with the Seattle Filipino American Community Today. Seattle: Demonstration Project for Asian Americans.

7. Hill, Robert B. 1971. The Strengths of Black Families - New York: National Urban League.

8. Houston, Jeanne and Houston, James D. 1973. Farewell to Manzanar, New York: Bantam Books, Inc.

9. Kim, Bok Lim. 1975a. "Plight of Asian Wives of Americans," pp. 30-35 in Response.

10. _____ and Margaret E. Condon. 1975b. A study of Asian Americans in Chicago: Their Socioeconomic Characteristics, Problems and Service Needs. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Mental Health, HEW.

11. Kim, Sil Dong. 1975. Problems of Asian American Wives of US Servicemen. Seattle: Demonstration Project for Asian Americans.

12. Kingston, Maxine Hong. 1977. The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood among Ghosts. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

13. Kitano, Harry. 1976. Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice - Hall, Inc.

14. Lasker, Bruno. 1931. Filipino Immigration to the Continental United States and Hawaii. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

15. Lyman, Stanford M. 1970a. "Strangers in the City: The Chinese on the Urban Frontier". pp. 9-25 in Stanford M. Lyman, The Asian in the West, Nevada: Social Science and Humanities Publications #4, Western Studies Center, Desert Research Institute.

16. _____ 1970b. "Marriage and the Family among Chinese Immigrants to America, 1850-1960". pp. 27-31.

17. _____ 1970c. Social Demography of the Chinese and Japanese in the U. S. of America". pp. 65-80.

18. McWilliam, Carey. 1964. Brothers Under the Skin. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

19. Morales, Royal. 1974. Makibaka. Los Angeles: Mountainview Publishers, Inc.

20. Morishima, James K. 1973. "The Evaluation: Impact on the Family". pp. 13-19 in Stanley Sue and Nathaniel N. Wagner (ed), Asian Americans, Psychological Perspectives. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, Inc.

21. Nee, Victor G. and Brett de Bary Nee. 1976. "Six in the Morning, Six at Night: Growing Up in a Chinatown Grocery Store". pp. 345-346 in Emma Gee (ed), Counterpoint: Perspective on Asian Americans, Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center, UCLA.

22. Petersen, William. 1971. Japanese Americans, Oppression and Success. New York: Random House.

23. Pian, Canta. 1974. A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census, Volume II: Asian Americans. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

24. Strong, Edward K. Jr. 1934. The Second Generation Japanese Problems. Stanford: University Press.

25. Sung, Betty Lee. 1967. The Story of the Chinese in America. New York: Collier Books.

The Socioeconomic Status of Asian American Families in Five Major SMSAs with particular regard to the relevance of commonly-used indicators of economic welfare

Prepared for the
Conference on Pacific and Asian American Families
and HEW-related Issues

Airlie, Virginia, March 9-12, 1978

by
David M. Moulton

ASIAN AMERICAN SERVICE INSTITUTE FOR ASSISTANCE TO NEIGHBORHOODS
ASIAN, inc.
1610 BUSH ST. • SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94109 • PH. (415) 928-6910 •

ASIAN, Inc.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chairperson:	Yone Satoda
Vice Chairperson:	Gerald Chan
Secretary/Treasurer:	Zoilo Inacay

Amey Aizawa	Steve Doi
Lina Block	Norman Lew
Richard Cerbatos	Eugene Louis
Huali Chai	Robert Mah
Sam Ching	Yori Wada
Ron Dizon	

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Demographic structure of the Asian American population	
	Numbers and distribution	5
	Family characteristics	19
III.	Economic structure	
	Common measures of economic welfare	33
	Alternative considerations	36
	Income and labor force participation	38
	Occupational status	44
	Effects of education on income	49
IV.	Poverty	
	Definitions of poverty	64
	Poverty characteristics	65
	Utilization of public assistance	69
V.	Conclusions and recommendations	75

TABLES

		Page
1.	Numbers and distribution of Asian Americans: immigrants and refugees	7-10
2.	Population, births, and deaths of Asians in California and Hawaii	13-15
3.	Estimates of Asian American population since 1970	17
4.	Characteristics of the Japanese population	20
5.	Characteristics of the Chinese population	21
6.	Characteristics of the Filipino population	22
7.	Characteristics of the Hawaiian and Korean population	23
8.	Characteristics of the non-Spanish White population	24-25
9.	Unemployment and family income	35
10.	Income and labor force participation, by SMSA	39-42
11.	Asian-owned businesses	46
12.	Low-status, low-income occupations	48
13.	Educational attainment and enrollment	50-51
14.	Educational attainment and earnings, across ethnic groups	53-55
15.	Returns to education, within ethnic groups	56-60
16.	White-Asian income differentials as a function of education	61
17.	Poverty status	66
18.	Low-income status	67
19.	Public assistance-poverty ratios	70
20.	Major social service programs	72

Foreword

This paper was prepared for the Conference on Pacific and Asian American Families and HEW-related Issues, which was intended to "examine the knowledge base on Pacific and Asian American families and to assess the impact of Federal programs and policies for this population." In this paper, socioeconomic data are examined quantitatively to elucidate the structure and condition of the Asian American family. HEW programs, especially those with a welfare orientation, are primarily redistributive efforts aimed at lightening the burdens on the disadvantaged. The eligible population is defined by a set of measures of economic welfare, of which the most widely used are family income, unemployment, female head of household, and educational level.

The thesis upon which this paper is based is that the Asian American family differs in many ways from the "typical" (white) American family and from those of the other minority groups - blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans, which are more familiar to the framers of Federal policies. As a consequence, the conventional indicators, which are convenient and may be fairly accurate measures of welfare in these other population groups, do not adequately depict the disadvantaged conditions under which many Asians live. The paper demonstrates that alternative measures give a far less optimistic picture of the true situation - a picture which is experientially familiar to community members but is not statistically

documented. As long as the present indicators and the present approach are maintained by HEW (and other government agencies) the Asian population will continue to be underserved by Federal programs designed to aid the disadvantaged.

The Socioeconomic Status of Asian American Families in Five Major SMSAs

by
David M. Moulton*

I. INTRODUCTION

The "typical" American family is studied, measured, described, and analyzed in a myriad of reports every year. The "atypical" Asian American family is not covered in the overwhelming majority of such reports. A few statistical studies on Asian Americans have appeared recently. A Study of Selected Socioeconomic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census, volume II: Asian Americans, produced by the Office of Special Concerns, HEW, uses many of the same data sources as the present report, (Census and Immigration reports) and the point of view and conclusions are similar. That study, however, was concerned primarily with Asians in the aggregate across the United States. It will be argued below that Asians in Hawaii are very different from their mainland cousins and that there are important differences among mainland populations in different cities, depending greatly upon whether they consist mainly of recent immigrants or older populations. Economic Conditions of

---

*The author is a Social Science Analyst at ASIAN, Inc. He acknowledges the comments and assistance of Amado Cabezas, Harold Yee, Pauline Fong, and Sarah Jang, all of ASIAN, Inc.; and of Canta Pian, Division of Asian American Affairs, HEW, and Joy Quill, of the HEW Regional Office, Region IX.

Asian Americans by the Asian American Mental Health Research Center (AAMHRC Occasional Paper No. 3) uses the same sources plus a survey of Vietnamese refugees. Again, national data only were presented.

The Asian American Field Survey, also from the Office of Special Concerns, HEW, surveyed roughly 500 each of Chinese in New York; Japanese, Koreans, and Samoans in Los Angeles; and Filipinos in San Francisco in 1973. Although the survey was conducted to determine needs for health and welfare programs, a considerable amount of data on family structure and income was collected. Unfortunately for the purpose of the present paper, the sample was limited to low-income, high-ethnic density areas and thus does not give a picture of the complete population. For example. the Japanese in Los Angeles had in the survey area a median age of 50, whereas the entire Japanese population of that SMSA had a median age of 30 (men), 32 (women) in the 1970 Census (see Table 4).

Because of the different geographical coverage of these reports, they were not used extensively in the preparation of the present paper. However, the reader familiar with them will find very little in disagreement with their findings. In particular, they represent the only data for Vietnamese and Samoans, and add substantially to the understanding of the Korean population.

Of a quite different nature is the recently released study of Cabezas and Yee, of ASIAN, Inc.: Discriminatory Employment of Asian Americans: Private Industry in the San Francisco-Oakland SMSA (July 1977). This work, while primarily concerned with employment characteristics of Asians, yields valuable insights into the reasons for low incomes among Asian wage earners. Based primarily upon EEO-1 reports (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) for 1975, it provides newer data than the census for this SMSA. One drawback is that EEO-1 reports do not identify specific ethnicities. The findings of this report are many, but those of most interest here are the following: Asians tend to have a high labor force participation rate (especially the women) and low unemployment. However they are conspicuously clustered into particular industries and occupations. In general, they are in low-wage industries (restaurants, department stores, clothing, and miscellaneous retail; hotels and hospitals; banking and insurance) and, in these, in low-status occupations (food service workers--busboys, dishwashers; sales clerks; orderlies; clerical jobs-especially those not involving public contact.) In industries where they are employed as professionals (electronics, banking, etc.) they do not rise to managerial positions. They are not often employed as professionals in more "public" fields such as newspapers, airlines, broadcasting and entertainment. Though many Asian males (primarily Chinese and Japanese) hold managerial jobs, these are mainly as small business proprietors. They are excluded from sales jobs requiring "salesmanship" rather than merely punching a cash register. They are excluded from the

better blue-collar jobs such as skilled crafts, transport operatives, police and fire services, tending rather to be operatives only in sewing factories or service workers. From all of these the picture emerges of persons who are working hard but not receiving substantial rewards for their labors or attaining responsible positions. There are indications that the same is true for other mainland cities. These findings provide insights into the low individual earnings of Asians which will be detailed later in this report.

The present study will examine the situation of Asian families in the five areas of their greatest concentration in the United States, with particular reference to the "Welfare" part of Health, Education, and Welfare.

II. Demographic structure of the Asian American population

Numbers and distribution

Asians are concentrated in a relatively few areas of the country. According to the 1970 Census, approximately 87% of Hawaiians, 73% of Japanese, and 69% of Filipinos lived in California and Hawaii. Seventy-one percent of Chinese lived in those two states plus New York. Koreans were the only group showing an exception to this pattern, with less than 40% in California and the Honolulu SMSA (data were not given for the entire state of Hawaii). Fifty to sixty percent of the three major ethnicities are found in just five SMSAs (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas) - Honolulu, Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York, and Chicago, and over 90% of the total are located in urban areas. By contrast, only 14% of all Americans live in these SMSAs, and more than 25% are non-urban. It is the intent of this paper to contrast the social and economic conditions of Asian American families with those of the dominant group (whites, not of Spanish origin) to which the majority of Americans belong. Since the geographical distribution of Asians is so different from that of "typical" Americans, the analysis will focus on these five SMSAs to make the normalization more valid. Asian Americans and whites living in each of these areas will be compared rather than using the entire nation as a standard since the many whites living in other areas nationwide would give an inaccurate picture of the relative position of the two groups.

Most of the demographic data presented here are taken from the published reports of the 1970 census, including the Summary Manpower Indicators prepared for the five SMSAs by the Department of Labor.[1/] In addition, special runs were made using the 2% Public Use Samples of Census data.[2/] Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service[3/] and various special reports furnished the remainder of the source material. Since the Census provided detailed data for only the three largest groups - Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos - much of the discussion is limited to these. For Hawaiians and Koreans, very little is available; for Vietnamese, Samoans, and others, there is practically nothing. The frequent omission of these groups in this paper is due solely to a lack of data.

Table 1 shows the numbers and distribution of Asian Americans according to census, immigration, alien address, and refugee resettlement reports. In addition, there are informal estimates of 20,000 - 40,000 Samoans in Southern California, primarily the Los Angeles SMSA.[4/] It can be seen from Table 1B

1/ U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970: General Population Characteristics, Series PC(1)-B (by State)
Detailed Characteristics, Series PC(1)-D (by State)
Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, Final Report PC(2)-1G
U.S. Department of Labor, 1972:
Summary Manpower Indicators, by SMSA (from the Second and Fourth Count tapes of the 1970 Census)

2/ The author gratefully acknowledges the services of Mr. Robert Healey of the Computer Center, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratories, who programmed and ran these tabulations.

3/ Immigration and Naturalization Service: Annual Reports, 1971-1975

4/ Ramsay Shu and Adele Salamasina Satele, The Samoan Community in Southern California: Conditions and Needs. Chicago: Asian American Mental Health Research Center Occasional Paper No.2, 1977, p.7

TABLE 1A

Total Number of Asian Americans, by Ethnicity in 5 SMSAs
1970 Census (20% count)

Ethnicity	SMSA					
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland	U.S. Total
Japanese(1)	15,732	169,025	104,494	16,630	33,587	588,324
Chinese (1)	11,995	48,897	41,500	77,099	88,402	431,583
Filipino(1)	11,568	66,653	32,018	12,455	44,326	336,731
Hawaiian(2)	479	53,709	4,634	884	3,641	99,958
Korean (2)	2,936	8,058	8,650	5,097	2,657	65,510

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1970: Final report PC(2)-IG: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States.
U.S. Department of Labor: Summary Manpower Indicators: Chicago, Honolulu, Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco SMSAs.

(1) Other large concentrations: Japanese, San Diego SMSA, 16,177; Chinese, Boston SMSA, 12,157; Filipinos, San Diego SMSA, 15,069 (20% samples)

(2) Hawaiian and Korean figures are 20% sample for U.S.total.

TABLE 1B

Immigration, July 1, 1970 - June 30, 1975
to Cities of Over 100,000 Population in the SMSAs

Ethnicity	SMSA					
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland	U.S. Total
Japanese(3)	84	358	427	350	211	25,910
Chinese(4)	2,386	2,007	5,889	20,411	9,183	107,120
Filipino	11,030	9,437	13,204	9,611	15,244	153,254
Korean	4,596	4,282	10,528	7,977	2,177	112,493
Other(5)	196	40	283	326	74	40,969

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service: Annual Reports, 1971 - 1975.
(3) Japanese to cities in 1974 only; U.S. total (5 years) includes Ryukyu Islands
(4) Chinese: Hong Kong included for all years in U.S. total but to cities in 1975 only
(5) City totals: Thais in 1974 only. National totals include Burma (1971 only), Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam.

TABLE 1C

Alien Address Reports, January 1975

Nationality	State of residence and number of permanent residents				
	California	Hawaii	Illinois	New York	U.S. Total
Burma	941	11	169	323	2,076
Cambodia	30	--	2	13	106
China & Taiwan	40,084	2,301	4,852	30,441	113,894
Indonesia	1,031	50	116	362	2,589
Japan	25,762	12,611	1,991	3,857	66,234
Korea	24,832	4,334	7,234	10,348	95,863
Laos	15	11	5	10	117
Malaysia	435	56	85	310	1,626
Philippines	70,468	30,463	14,477	12,165	183,402
Singapore	334	31	21	241	918
Thailand	2,820	318	1,644	1,806	16,405
Vietnam	1,854	398	374	535	10,749
Pacific Islands(6)	2,855	1,635	33	64	6,710

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service: Annual Reports
(6) Fiji, Nauru, New Guinea, U.S. administered territories, Tonga, Western Samoa

TABLE 1D

Refugees

As of September 1, 1977, 145,700 Southeast Asian refugees had been resettled in the United States. Of these, 140,774 had reported under the alien address program in January 1977, as shown below:

State	Ethnicity			
	Vietnamese	Cambodian	Laotian	rank (total no. of refugees)
California	31,255	1,612	1,355	1
Texas	10,889	402	710	2
Pennsylvania	6,329	228	271	3
Illinois	3,437	179	498	8
New York	3,475	188	366	9
Hawaii	1,837	19	539	18
All others	68,130	2,975	6,080	-
Total	125,352	5,603	9,819	-

Source: HEW Refugee Task Force - Report to the Congress, September 21, 1977

that immigration flows mainly to those areas where there are already substantial numbers of each community. If past trends can be extrapolated to the 1976-78 period, it is expected that there will have been an additional 15,000 Japanese (at a slowly declining annual rate), 75,000 Chinese (rising slightly), 95,000 Filipinos (steady) and 90,000 Koreans (rising to a plateau around 30,000-32,000 annually), entering the U.S. by June 1978. In August 1977 the U.S. Attorney General authorized the admission of 15,000 more Southeast Asian refugees, and the continued stream of "boat people" to Thailand, the Philippines, etc., may lead to further admissions. Thus, the Asian population of the United States is rapidly becoming both larger and more diversified in its make-up.

The continuing presence of over 100,000 American troops in Asia (principally Japan and South Korea) will undoubtedly remain a major source of immigration for women. Although there are no figures directed explicitly at this group, INS reports show how nearly 10,000 persons admitted as "wives of U.S. citizens" from these countries, the Philippines, and Thailand in 1975. For all immigrants from these countries, the number of women in the age range 20-29 exceeded the number of men in that age range by 8,400, or a ratio of 2.3 to 1.[5/] For women from China and India where there are no bases, no such distribution is observed.

Besides the persons who are tabulated as immigrants, there are many non-immigrant Asians admitted to the United States - over a million in 1975, of whom 80% were Japanese, mainly tour-

---

5/ Immigration and Naturalization Service: Annual Report, 1975, Table 6

ists.[6] Most, of course, return home, but between April 1970 and July 1975 approximately 20,300 Chinese, 14,900 Filipinos, 13,200 Koreans, and 7,700 Japanese entered the country as non-immigrants and had their status adjusted to immigrants later during this period.[7] (The exact numbers are not derivable from INS reports.) Most of these were tourists or students at the time of entry. These persons are not included as immigrants in Table 1B.

No accurate figures are available for the number of Asian Americans at the present time. However, the immigration records can be combined with the measured numbers of births and deaths in California[8] to produce yearly state totals, and from these, birth and death rates (Table 2). Numbers for Filipinos between 1970 and 1972 have been approximated for the births and deaths for "others" in that period. (Filipinos have been separately identified by the State Department of Health in these tabulations only since 1973.) The rates, in births/deaths per 1000, are calculated from population estimates which were made using immigration and vital statistics and assuming no net interstate migration. A number of assumptions and approximations have been made in this table so that the exact numbers must be viewed with caution.

Birth and death statistics for Hawaii have also been made available (Table 2B). Here there is a conceptual difficulty with the definition of ethnicities. The State Department of

---

6/ IBID, Table 17

7/ Approximate calculation by author of data from Immigration and Naturalization Service Annual Reports, 1971-75, Table 6B.

8/ Communication from the California State Department of Health

TABLE 2A

Births and deaths of Asian Americans in California, 1970-76
Approximate mid year population and birth and death rates

Group and Statistic	Year and number of persons or rate						
	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Japanese:							
births	2,841	2,753	2,497	2,825	2,682	2,705	2,826
deaths	916	976	972	983	974	1,027	964
population	214,157	217,819	221,718	225,741	229,614	233,156	236,726
birthrate	13.3	12.6	11.3	12.5	11.7	11.6	11.9
deathrate	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.1
Chinese:							
births	2,740	2,576	2,345	2,899	3,060	3,247	3,761
deaths	891	880	909	978	958	1,008	1,027
population	171,468	177,156	184,943	193,920	204,501	215,411	226,797
birthrate	16.0	14.5	12.7	14.9	15.0	15.1	16.6
deathrate	5.2	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.5
Filipino:							
births	(4,512)	(4,495)	(4,688)	3,877	4,790	4,992	5,417
deaths	(245)	(235)	(239)	214	212	279	350
population	142,236	155,625	170,311	186,208	203,813	221,828	240,779
birthrate	(23.9)	(23.6)	(23.9)	20.2	21.3	23.8	25.4
deathrate	(3.6)	(3.5)	(3.4)	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.2
Koreans:							
population	16,640	19,624	24,141	30,194	37,680	45,251	53,053

Source: Births and deaths from the Center for Health Statistics, California State Department of Health. Figures in parentheses for Filipinos, 1970-1972 are estimates.

Population estimated by author from 1970 Census figures, Immigration Annual reports, and the given births and deaths.

Birthrates and deathrates based on these population figures.

Birth and death rates are the number of events per 1000 population.
Korean population estimated using Chinese birthrates and Filipino deathrates (see text)

TABLE 2B

Births and deaths of Asian Americans in Hawaii, 1970 to 1976
Population and birth and death rates, 1970 and 1976

Group and Statistic	Year and number of persons or rate					
	1970	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Japanese:						
births	2,860	(2,451)	(2,371)	2,371	2,242	2,422
deaths	1,162	1,229	1,272	1,273	1,285	1,203
population	217,175					242,465
birthrate						10.7
deathrate						5.3
Chinese:						
births	515	(511)	(533)	573	567	614
deaths	224	252	277	248	267	305
population	52,583					48,449
birthrate						16.8
deathrate						8.3
Filipinos:						
births	2,507	(2,579)	(2,616)	2,692	2,753	2,792
deaths	576	623	615	543	598	598
population	95,680					112,913
birthrate						32.2
deathrate						6.9
Hawaiians:						
births	4,787	(3,210)	(3,299)	4,408	4,525	4,750
deaths	720	717	711	788	721	796
population	72,395					101,510
birthrate						31.4
deathrate						5.3
Koreans:						
births	144	(215)	(229)	199	215	193
deaths	69	54	59	66	57	59
population	8,914					13,309
birthrate						17.6
deathrate						5.4
Samoans:						
births	--	(343)	(330)	312	411	(395)
deaths	--	32	28	45	48	38
birthrate						87.1
deathrate						8.4

Source: State of Hawaii, Department of Health, Research and Statistics office.

Birth and death rates are the number of events per 1000 population.
See notes to this table on next page.

Notes to Table 2B (Hawaii)

Birth and death events are assigned to ethnicities according to pre-1950 Census rules. Populations are assigned according to current rules (self-association or ethnic group of father). An alternative definition (by the State Department of Health) gives the following 1976 populations:

	Japanese	Filipino	Chinese	Hawaiian	Part-Hawaiian	Korean	Samoan
Census	242,465	112,913	48,449	101,510		13,309	--
Dept.of Health	226,571	86,715	36,570	11,422	139,689	10,941	4,537

Births for the years 1972-1973 and for Samoans in 1976 are assigned according to the race of the mother. However, for all populations except Hawaiians and Koreans these are comparable with the births according to the race of the child, as given above, for the years 1974-76 when both sets of figures are tabulated. "Hawaiian" births and deaths are for Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians.

The birthrates for 1976 are based on the alternative (Department of Health) definition of population to be consistent with the definition of the race of the child.

Health categorizes ethnicities in various ways: population by the respondent's self-evaluation or race of the father, and births by the race of the child, or of either parent. It appears that persons with Hawaiian ancestry of any amount are listed as "part-Hawaiian" by the State of Hawaii. Certain state-sponsored programs are open only to persons of Hawaiian ancestry, so there may be an attempt to use definitions which maximize the numbers of such persons. (See the note to Table 2B.) At any rate, the Hawaii figures are used to corroborate the magnitudes of the California birth and death rates. For Japanese and for Chinese births, the values are fairly close. For Chinese and Filipino deaths the lower California rates are expected from the fact that the populations have more immigrants and tend to be younger. The higher Filipino birthrate in Hawaii probably reflects that group's low socioeconomic status.

Using the California birth and death rates shown, calculations may be made for the entire nation (Table 3). For Koreans, no figures are available, but consideration of the age structure and socioeconomic status of the population suggests a moderate birth rate and a low death rate. For this reason the birth rate for Chinese and the death rate for Filipinos have been arbitrarily applied to Koreans. Whereas more approximations are made in birth and death rates for Koreans and Filipinos than for the other ethnicities, it is precisely these latter two groups in which the effects of immigration totally overshadow the natural increase so that the errors from the approximation are less serious.

TABLE 3

Estimates of Asian American Population, U.S.A.,1970-76
Excludes temporary vistors

Group and Component	Year and number of persons						
	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Japanese:							
natural increase		5,121	4,576	4,674	4,949	4,747	4,927
immigration*		5,883	7,305	7,603	6,817	6,006	(5,600)
total	593,720	604,724	616,605	628,882	640,648	651,401	661,928
Chinese:							
natural increase		4,582	4,123	5,705	6,671	5,982	6,913
immigration*		18,335	24,856	27,165	28,394	28,652	(29,000)
total	440,726	463,643	492,622	525,492	560,557	595,191	631,104
Filipinos:							
natural increase		7,497	8,323	8,379	8,638	10,478	12,604
immigration*		29,345	32,061	34,524	36,895	35,371	(35,000)
total	352,765	389,607	429,991	472,894	518,427	564,276	611,880
Koreans:							
natural increase		882	954	1,267	1,756	2,076	2,663
immigration*		14,755	21,615	26,848	31,987	30,452	(31,000)
total	68,042	83,679	106,248	134,363	168,106	200,634	234,297

Source: initial population base: U.S. Census, 1970
immigration: Immigration annual reports
natural increase: California rates, by year and ethnicity, applied to the total population.

*"Immigration" includes aliens entering after April 1970 adjusted to immigrant status. 1976 immigration is estimated.
Total population is at midyear.

Tables 2 and 3 show similar trends. The Japanese population is growing, but rather slowly. Chinese are catching up, and Filipinos are catching up with both. In the 1976-77 period all three groups are expected to be about the same size- about 240,000 in California and 670,000 nationally. By 1980 the order will be reversed: Filipinos first, Chinese second and Japanese third. At that point, the number of Koreans will be about what the Filipinos were in 1970. The birth rates in Table 2 indicate a slow natural increase for Japanese, a moderate increase for Chinese (slightly above U.S. totals in recent years) and extremely high rates for Filipinos - the highest of any racial group in California. (Birth rates for Hispanics are not available; however, there are indications from the 1970 census - the proportion of children under 6 - that they may be somewhat above those for Filipinos.) Birthrates for the three groups fell from 1970 to 1975, but there appears to have been a reversal of this in 1976, as with the total population of California. Deathrates are so remarkably low as to lead to the suspicion that they may have not been reported completely. However, there are large proportions of young people, especially among recent immigrants in the Chinese and Filipino populations, which could lower the death rates considerably.

Family Characteristics

Turning to the five SMSAs (Tables 4-7)we see more detailed characteristics for the Asian populations. For comparison, the non-Spanish white population is shown in Table 8. Unless otherwise specified, the data is from the 1970 census report "Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos." Population updates cannot be made since the Immigration and Naturalization Service figures show migration to cities of over 100,000 inhabitants only, and all of the SMSAs contain many smaller cities. In addition there is a likelihood of substantial intrastate migration, especially in California where there are several other major SMSAs directly adjacent to the Los Angeles and San Francisco-Oakland SMSAs. A number of special tabulations were made from the Public Use Sample Tapes of the 1970 Census: these are designated by an (S) in the margin. In these, only a 2% sample of the population was used, versus a 20% sample for most of the other figures. Thus all numbers in the special tabulations will be to the nearest 50. In these cases the sampling error may be quite large.

Two further facts should be kept in mind. First, the Census adopted the convention with regard to children of mixed heritage that the race of the child was considered to be the race of the father, unless otherwise specified. Similarly, families are classified by the race of the head, which is taken to be a male if present. Thus a family with a white husband and a Japanese wife, for example, would be considered a white family unless it were dissolved, at which point it would become a

TABLE 4
Selected Characteristics of the Japanese Population
in 5 SMSAs, 1970

Characteristics	SMSA				
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles-Long Beach	New York	San Francisco-Oakland
Total persons	15,732	169,025	104,494	16,630	33,587
Under 18	4,492	52,164	31,246	3,935	8,807
Number of families	3,750	39,513	25,372	4,127	7,532
Husband-wife families	3,313	34,151	21,938	3,714	6,488
Female-headed families	284	3,510	2,361	207	804
Extended families (S)	450	5,300	3,200	300	1,000
Families with: children under 18	2,189	23,730	15,205	2,308	4,366
children under 6	904	9,658	6,532	1,555	1,918
Husbands with wives	3,353	36,266	22,368	3,729	6,586
wife of different race	535	2,766	1,714	584	769
Wives with husbands	4,116	39,638	24,987	4,299	8,900
Husband of different race	1,287*	6,118	4,448	1,122	3,078
Women with non-Asian husbands (S)	1,350*	1,950	3,350	900	2,900
number of children in such families (S)	2,600	2,600	4,700	1,300	3,200
Divorced, separated: men	266	2,448	1,765	566	589
women	340	3,924	2,692	429	996
Widowed: men	184	1,329	692	162	227
women	546	5,839	3,706	632	1,238
Unrelated individuals	1,832	9,868	10,682	3,342	4,869
Ratios of males to females	0.95	0.91	0.94	0.97	0.82
Median Age (S) M/F	34/36	27/30	30/32	31/33	30/31
Over 65	1,163	11,617	7,428	1,617	2,537
Foreign born	26.6	9.0	19.6	59.0	26.0

Note: Honolulu special tabulations (S) are for City of Honolulu only. For comparison, in the city there are 109,287 persons of Japanese ancestry, 25,970 families, and 3,161 wives with husbands of different race.
*The discrepancy between these two figures is due to the sampling error in the special tabulations.

TABLE 5
Selected Characteristics of the Chinese Population
in 5 SMSAs, 1970

Characteristics	SMSA				
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles-Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland
Total persons	11,995	48,897	41,500	77,099	88,402
Under 18	3,915	17,064	13,521	24,145	27,768
Number of families	2,589	11,448	9,141	17,593	19,650
Husband-wife families	2,393	9,668	8,079	15,777	17,170
Female-headed families	96	1,115	638	877	1,672
Extended families (S)	600	2,150	1,750	3,200	3,950
Families with:					
children under 18	1,723	6,863	5,779	10,898	11,833
children under 6	899	2,846	2,988	5,074	4,985
Husbands with wives	2,485	10,283	8,343	16,356	17,791
Wife of different race	245	2,958	1,054	1,124	1,008
Wives with husbands	2,437	10,034	8,124	15,640	17,646
Husband of different race	233	2,761	964	482	983
Women with non-Asian husbands (S)	150	350	400	400	600
number of children in such families(S)	250	300	500	250	750
Divorced, separated:					
men	297	932	953	3,027	2,260
women	234	1,048	818	1,281	1,548
Widowed: men	136	423	292	1,395	1,199
women	248	1,788	1,019	1,977	3,262
Unrelated individuals	1,448	2,468	5,035	8,600	9,514
Ratio of males to females	1.16	1.01	1.11	1.16	1.06
Median age (S) M/F	28/24	31/29	28/25	32/24	29/30
Over 65	663	3,880	1,893	5,440	6,688
Percent foreign born	56.7	11.3	50.7	64.9	46.8

Note: Honolulu special tabulations (S) are for city of Honolulu only
For comparison, in the city there are 36,517 persons of Chinese ancestry
8,684 families
1,583 wives with husbands of different race

TABLE 6
Selected Characteristics of the Filipino Population in 5 SMSAs, 1970

Characteristics	SMSA				
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles-Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland
Total persons	11,568	66,653	32,018	12,455	44,326
Under 18	3,030	28,116	10,455	2,940	15,741
Number of families	2,611	12,955	7,446	2,874	9,395
Husband-wife families	2,223	11,107	6,444	2,368	8,146
Female-headed families (S)	278	996	642	348	803
Extended families (S)	900	1,850	1,450	1,000	2,350
Families with:					
children under 18	1,500	9,249	4,681	1,542	6,218
children under 6	1,080	5,130	2,829	1,090	3,319
Husbands with wives	2,277	12,209	6,635	2,413	8,526
Wife of different race	620	3,423	2,150	895	1,736
Wives with husbands	2,186	10,821	6,043	2,004	8,180
Husband of different race	519	2,057	1,589	482	1,411
Women with non-Asian husbands (S)	300	350	950	300	1,200
number of children in such families (S)	300	700	1,300	250	2,300
Divorced, separated:					
Men	385	3,344	1,775	525	2,515
Women	319	1,904	1,001	448	1,492
Widowed: Men	63	914	207	128	334
Women	118	671	447	311	655
Unrelated individuals	2,584	5,946	4,707	3,217	4,934
Ratio of males to females	0.81	1.27	1.10	0.89	1.10
Median age (S) M/F	30/25	28/22	29/26	29/26	29/[illegible]
Over 65	465	3,707	1,865	868	2,688
Percent foreign born	74.8	34.0	60.1	69.3	64.7

Note: Honolulu special tabulations (S) are for city of Honolulu only
For comparison, in the city there are 29,073 persons of Filipino ancestry
5,713 families
893 wives with husbands of different race

TABLE 7
Selected Characteristics of the Hawaiian and Korean Populations, 1970

Characteristics	Hawaiians	Koreans		
	Honolulu SMSA	Honolulu SMSA	Los Angeles-Long Beach SMSA	New York SMSA
Total persons	55,175	8,914	8,811	4,925
Under 18 years old	25,036	3,348	2,816	1,568
Number of families	10,339	2,031	1,997	1,063
Husband-wife families	8,284	1,586	1,649	957
Female-headed families	1,480	371	250	55
Extended families (S)	1,500			
Families with:				
children under 18	7,191	1,364	1,251	708
children under 6	3,804	584	838	579
Women with non-Asian husbands (S)	600			
number of children in such families (S)	700			
Unrelated individuals*	3,378	635	1,012	737
Ratio of males to females	0.94	0.85	0.83	0.80
Median age (S) M/F	27/23			
Percent foreign born	0.2	21.0	61.5	62.7

Source of Tables 4-7
U.S. Census, 1970: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States
Special tabulations of the 2% Public Use Sample Tapes (designated by (S)).

Note: Ratio of males to females, for persons over 16 years old and over.
Honolulu special tabulations (S) are for city of Honolulu only.
For comparison, in the city there are 5,500 Hawaiian families (S)
2,350 Hawaiian unrelated individuals (S).

*Unrelated individuals estimated as 98% of the sum of (primary individuals + nonrelative of (family) head + non-inmates in group quarters)

TABLE 8

Selected Characteristics of the Non-Spanish White Population in 5 SMSAs, 1970

Characteristics	SMSA				
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland
Total persons	5,357,998	239,805	4,740,720	8,688,102	2,218,642
Under 18	1,717,535	81,633	1,324,058	2,413,930	612,549
Number of families	1,378,313	54,771	1,244,846	2,285,939	571,448
Female-headed	124,080	5,302	137,242	226,001	57,679
Extended families(S)	153,350	2,150	118,900	280,100	55,200
Families with children under18	730,046	34,695	616,532	1,104,840	284,246
Children under 6	336,343	18,225	261,345	481,298	123,019
Husbands with wives*	1,233,384	53,719	1,318,703	1,934,515	533,824
Wives with husbands*	1,240,452	51,590	1,134,036	1,975,681	532,334
Divorced,separated* men	80,010	9,392	152,860	108,610	69,016
women	108,557	7,660	223,563	149,983	92,447
Widowed* men	59,718	1,152	49,025	115,001	23,590
women	270,654	4,771	272,512	518,953	119,438
Unrelated individuals	489,475	45,377	683,310	913,387	352,267
Ratio of males to females	0.95	1.20	0.93	0.91	0.95
Median age(s): M/F	29/31	26/28	30/34	33/37	30/32
Over 65	541,111	9,182	549,281	1,125,009	247,441
Ratio of non-white Spanish to white	.003	.029	.013	.003	.020

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: General Population Characteristics.
California PC(1) - B6
Hawaii PC(1) - B13
Illinois PC(1) - B15
New York PC(1) - B34

Detailed Population Characteristics.
California PC(1) - D6
Hawaii PC(1) - D13
Illinois PC(1) - D15
New York PC(1) - D34

Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Summary Manpower Indicators

TABLE 8 (cont'd.)

Note: Honolulu special tabulations are for City of Honolulu only. For comparison, there are in the city 100,097 persons of non-Spanish white ancestry, and 26,943 families (Spanish-descent not removed). Most unfortunately, the 1970 Census did not place "race" and Spanish origin" on the same level in the Census questionaires so that confusion results in trying to distinguish "Anglo" white from total white, or Filipino from Spanish.

"Non-Spanish white" is derived for this paper by subtracting "Spanish" from "total white." A slight error is introduced since some "Spanish" are non-white. The Summary Manpower Indicators consider "Spanish American" to be the sum of "persons of Spanish language" and "persons of Spanish surname, not of Spanish language." Blacks, Native Americans, and Filipinos comprise most of these non-white "Spanish." Fortunately, the error is not large. The ratio of "non-white Spanish" to "total white" is shown above as a measure of the inaccuracy introduced by this approximation.

For the starred data (marital status), a lack of comparable data means that the report "Spanish Origin" (Census report PC (2) - 1C) is used for the correction. This definition gives numbers for Spanish Americans about 19% lower for Los Angeles, and 37% lower for San Francisco, than the "Spanish American" classification of the Summary Manpower Indicators. For Honolulu, "Spanish Origin" is not tabulated, and no correction is made for Spanish origin.

Japanese family if the wife retained custody of the children. The children would originally be considered white; after the separation they would probably be classified Japanese. On the other hand, if the husband were Japanese and the wife white, it would be a Japanese family. As mentioned previously and shown in the tables, the combination of non-Asian husband - Asian wife is more common than the reverse because of the presence of American troops in many parts of Asia. For this reason, tabulations have been made of the number of Asian women married to non-Asians, and of the numbers of children born to such couples. Second, the special tabulations for Honolulu were available for the city only, not the SMSA. A few comparisons of population size for this case are shown in the footnotes to the tables.

Using tables 4-7 we can obtain some information on the structure of Asian American families. Most Asians live in family units: on the average only about 10% are "unrelated individuals." This varies by ethnicity and location: about 6% of those in Honolulu are outside of families, while 22% of the Japanese and Filipinos in New York and Filipinos in Chicago are unrelated individuals. For whites, 9% are unrelated individuals in Chicago, 10-11% in New York and Los Angeles, and 16-19% in San Francisco and Honolulu. Most of the families have children: 56-60% for Japanese, 60-67% for Chinese, 63-67% for Koreans, and 70% for Hawaiians (in Honolulu). For Filipinos the ratios are more diverse: 54-57% in New York and Chicago (small middle-class populations) to 66-71% in San

Francisco and Honolulu (larger, working class groups). Among whites, the ratios are 48-53% except for Honolulu (63%). Fertility rates are not available for individual cities, but the California figures of Table 2 are consistent with the ranking of percentage with children: Filipinos, then Chinese, then Japanese.

Most families, not surprisingly, are husband-wife families: female-headed families are relatively rare, averaging under 10% of all families in most cases. (The major exceptions are 18% Koreans in Honolulu, 14% Hawaiians in Honolulu, 13% Koreans in Los Angeles, and 12% Filipinos in New York.) For Chinese the numbers of female-headed families are especially low. White families have a rather constant 9-11% of such families. Divorce and separation are likewise infrequent among Asians: in most cases, only 6-8% of all persons over 14 have broken marriages. In those instances where the numbers exceed 9% (Filipino males in all cities, Filipino females in Honolulu, New York, and San Francisco, and Chinese males in New York) The preponderant reason is "wife/or husband absent", suggesting a time lag in immigration where one spouse arrives first and later is able to bring over the other. For whites, the figures on divorce and separation are somewhat lower in Honolulu, Chicago, and New York (3-6%) and about the same in California (6-10%). It should be remembered that these are 1970 figures: it is felt by some that there has been an increase in divorces and separations among Asians since that time.

As expected from the greater longevity of females, widows outnumber widowers in all cases except for Filipinos in Hawaii. Here, the extraordinarily high ratio of males to females (5 to 4) reflects the pattern of immigration of male agricultural laborers in the '20's and '30's coupled with the greater tolerance of interracial marriage in Hawaii than on the mainland. Presumably, the typical married Filipino 30 years ago in Honolulu was a man with a non-Filipino wife. Because of past discriminatory immigration practices, high male/female ratios are also found among Filipinos in California and Chinese in all cities, but the low number of widowers makes it appear that the elderly males in these cases had not married. (In California, anti-miscegenation laws prevented marriages of Asians to whites.)

The extended family is traditional in the Asian root cultures. To see how much this persisted in the United States, an "extended family" was defined as any family containing related persons other than the spouse or children of the head. The percentages of such families varied considerably. Nearly 35% of Filipino families in New York and Chicago, and 25% in San Francisco, were so constituted ; however, in Honolulu, only 14% contained other persons. Chinese families showed a rather uniform level of 18-25% extended families in all cities. For Japanese the levels were lower: 7% in New York, 12-13% for the other mainland cities, and 20% in Honolulu. In contrast to Filipinos, both Chinese and Japanese had their highest levels of extended families in Honolulu. White families had rates of 9% in California and Honolulu, and 11-12% in Chicago and New York.

Intermarriage between Asians and members of other ethnic groups is of interest for two reasons. First, as mentioned above, the Census records the ethnicity of such persons according to the ethnicity of the father unless there is a definite statement to the contrary. Thus, many part-Asian persons are not counted in the official figures. Second, it is unclear to what extent persons of mixed ethnicity retain their ethnic identity. Persons with mixed Asian parentage appear to remain "Asian", but when the other parent is black or white there may be a tendency to assimilate into these larger groups. From Census data it is evident that there are great differences in the rates of intermarriage. Among Chinese, intermarriage rates are very low in the large communities of New York and San Francisco (3-7%), moderate in Los Angeles and Chicago (9-13%) and very high in Honolulu (28-29%). No pronounced differences between men and women are apparent. With Japanese, intermarriage rates are moderate for men (8-16%) but very high for women (15-35%), reflecting the "war bride" phenomenon superimposed upon the normal rate of intermarriage for mainland Japanese women. Not surprisingly, intermarriage is lowest in Honolulu and Los Angeles where the Japanese population is largest so that selection from within the community is easier. The greatest influx of Japanese war brides seems to have been to the San Francisco area, where there are proportionately the most Japanese women with non-Japanese husbands. Filipinos show extremely high rates of intermarriage for both men (20-37%) and women (17-26%). Cultural differences between Filipinos and the other Asian groups are

undoubtedly one of the reasons for this difference. In addition, at least two historical circumstances may have had an effect. The first was the arrival of young single Filipino men in the '20s and early '30s and the cutoff of further immigration in 1932 so that they could not be joined later by women: intermarriage with non-Filipinos, even when illegal, was then the only possibility for marriage at all. The second circumstance is, as mentioned earlier, military wives.

Special tabulations of the 1970 Census Public Use Samples were made of the number of wives with non-Asian husbands. This differs from the previous definition in that it excludes intermarriage among different Asian ethnicities, where any children would still be counted as Asian. A comparison between the two difinitions shows that most intermarriages in Honolulu involve other Asians rather than whites or blacks. To a lesser extent this occurs in Los Angeles, but is not very important in the other three cities. The approximate number of children from such families, who were presumably not counted as Asians in the Census, was 14,400 Japanese, 2,050 Chinese, and 4,850 Filipinos. (Note: these persons were not added to the population estimates made in this paper, and no corrections were made for intermarriages.)

The number of persons who were foreign born in 1970 gives some indication as to the makeup of the population. Japanese were overwhelmingly American born except in New York. Since the recent immigration of Japanese to New York is low (Table 1B) it would appear that many of these were Japanese nationals residing

semipermanently in the United States on business assignments.[9] For Chinese, about half were native born in 1970; for Filipinos and Koreans, about two-thirds, which is to be expected considering the recent immigration history of these groups. However, in Honolulu the percentage of foreign born is far lower for all Asian groups than on the mainland. This again reflects a historical pattern: there was early immigration to Hawaii to work on the plantations, but much lower rates of arrival in postwar years. Since Hawaii was not a state in these early days, the Asian exclusion regulations on immigration did not apply. With more equal sex ratios, many children were born, giving by the present time a predominantly native population. In 1970, Asians outnumbered whites by 3 to 2 in the state. Given these circumstances, it would be expected that Asians in Hawaii would not show the same social characteristics as those on the mainland.

9/ Foreign nationals appear to have been counted in the Census if they resided in the United States on Census day. The 1970 Census Users' Guide, Part 1, states "The total population of a geographic area recognized in census tabulations comprises all persons enumerated whose usual place of residence at time of census was determined to be in that area."

"Citizens of foreign countries temporarily visiting or traveling in the United States or living on the premises of an embassy,legation, etc. were not enumerated. Resident aliens were enumerated like other Americans." (Concept 50, Census Users' Dictionary, p.93) The 100% Census form, question 1, asks for persons "living here...or staying or visiting here and had no other home." Although this question is not addressed directly, it may be inferred that foreign nationals assigned to the United States for a period long enough to cause them to give up any previous residence (i.e., a period of years) would be counted. The 100% form does not ask about citizenship or immigration status.

The picture of Asian American families in 1970 that emerges from these figures shows a rather close-knit, male-headed family structure, frequently in an extended family, with few divorces or separations. Filipinos have the most children, then Chinese and Koreans, and finally Japanese. Intermarriages are common in Hawaii (usually within Asian groups) and everywhere for Japanese women (military wives) and Filipinos, both women and men. Japanese men and Chinese men and women intermarry rather infrequently. In Chicago and New York there are relatively greater proportions of Asians living alone or in childless families.

III. Economic Structure

Common measures of economic welfare

Asian families, we see, are socially stable. How do they fare in terms of economic well-being? There are two common indicators of economic welfare - employment (or unemployment) and family income. However, it wil be a principal thesis of this paper that neither of these indices is adequate to describe the true situation of Asian American families.

Conceptually, "economic welfare" can be defined as how successfully people are satisfying their economic needs - food, shelter, transportation, etc.* Welfare in this sense is difficult to measure since it is a conglomerate of various incommensurable factors. Accordingly, various partial indicators are taken to represent the whole concept. Such a procedure may be valid in comparing the welfare of different groups if the socioeconomic conditions under which such groups live are reasonably uniform. When these conditions are not the same, the indicators must be reexamined. Indicators optimized with respect to one type of behavior become suboptimal when applied to a group which behaves differently. It would be totally misleading, for example, to compare a family of inner-city renters with a farming family that owned its house and grew much of its own food on the basis of cash income alone. The differences between Asian and white Americans are much more subtle, yet they, too, cause the ordinary indicators to overstate Asian American welfare.

---

*The term "welfare" will be used in this sense; to refer to programs such as AFDC, food stamps, or social security we will use the term "public assistance."

Table 9A shows the two common measures of welfare for Asian Americans and the total population. For comparison, blacks have been added, since there is no argument that they are a seriously disadvantaged group. On this basis, it could be concluded that Asian Americans are rather well off. Indeed, such statistics have frequently been used to demonstrate that racial minorities can succeed in America (implying thereby that those who do not succeed are themselves to blame).

Further examination of these gross figures shows them to be misleading. Three major areas of concern are suggested. First, comparisons should be made with the "standard" population - the whites not of Hispanic origin (hereafter referred to as merely "white"). Other disadvantaged groups tend to lower the averages and thereby falsely inflate the status of Asians. Secondly, compariosns should be made within the same geographic regions. Costs of living vary substantially among different parts of the country and between urban and rural areas. It happens that most Asians are located in high-cost areas, especially those in Hawaii, whereas most other Americans live in areas where lower incomes are adequate. Finally, the common measures themselves do not adequately represent the economic expenditure patterns of Asian Americans.

The first two problems are rather well-known and can be disposed of by simply retabulating the figures: in Table 9B this is shown for family incomes. Now it can be seen that Chinese and Filipinos (except Chinese in Honolulu) are measurably less well off than whites. Hawaii is a special case:

Table 9A

Unemployment and family income for Asians, blacks, and U.S. total, 1969

Factor	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Black	U.S. Total
Unemployment rate, %:					
male	2.0	3.0	4.7	6.3	3.9
female	3.0	3.7	4.7	7.7	5.2
Median annual family income	$12,515	$10,610	$ 9,318	$ 6,063	$ 9,433

Table 9B

Median annual family income for 5 SMSAs, 1969

SMSA	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Black	White
Chicago	$13,478	$10,967	$11,734	$8,032	$12,957
Honolulu	14,222	14,437	10,083	6,741	10,909
Los Angeles	12,801	11,161	10,075	7,571	12,121
New York	12,375	8,136	11,725	7,309	12,663
San Francisco	12,045	10,045	10,122	7,964	12,752

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, U.S. Summary, Final Report PC(1)-D1 Summary Manpower Indicators

Median incomes for "White" calculated by the formula $Y = \frac{Y(aw) \times N(aw) - Y(s) \times N(s)}{N(aw) - N(s)}$, where Y is median income and N is number of families. Subscript aw refers to all white and subscript s is for Spanish. This is not an exact expression for the median, but is a good approximation when $N(aw) >> N(s)$ and $Y(aw)$ is not greatly different from $Y(s)$.

Asians (collectively) are the majority group, with Japanese comprising (in 1976) 29% of the population. (Whites were 34%, but of these 6%, by Health Department definitions, would be mixed or part Hawaiian.) Many (10-15%) whites in Hawaii are in the military, and are therefore of rather low money income. Under these circumstances one would expect substantially different patterns of employment and income from the mainland where Asian Americans constitute at most 6% of any SMSA's population (San Francisco). For some other SMSAs, the differences are even more striking. In the San Diego SMSA, median family incomes are $9,935 for Japanese and $6,877 for Filipinos; in the Boston SMSA it is $8,591 for Chinese (and $7,069 for the City of Boston). Asian family incomes remain higher than those for blacks, but by considerably reduced margins except in Honolulu and the small professional communities of Filipinos in New York and Chicago.

Alternative considerations

Welfare, however, is not simply a matter of income. Items which do not produce a cash inflow may be of extreme value to their recipients. Leisure time (i.e., all time not spent in working) is universally recognized as an economic good. "Leisure" time, in this sense,may be spent in any of many valuable but non-paying activities: self-improvement, supervision of children, participation in public affairs, household maintenance or improvement, etc., and of course the necessities of life such as eating and sleeping adequately, as well as recreation

or relaxation from all of the above. Education is regarded in human capital theory as an investment for the sake of future earning - i.e., an activity engaged in because it will produce greater future returns. Because it wishes to invest in education, feels insecure, or faces a high price structure, a family may perceive its cash needs as rather high and devote extra efforts to increasing its income. Other productive activities are thereby forfeited for present earnings. Low individual earnings by family heads will also lead to the forfeiting of "leisure" by other family members who must work to maintain an overall income level. In these cases the total welfare of the family cannot be measured solely by its cash income, but must be discounted by the loss of other foregone opportunities. Application of these considerations to the situation of Asian families will further clarify their economic situation.

Family cash income is of course the total of dollars earned by all family members. A given income level may be the result of either high earnings by the family head or lower earnings by two or more persons. Three types of statistic are pertinent here. Median income per male worker is a measure of the earning power of male family heads. If median individual earnings are low, moderate family income can still result from multiple earners: the number of workers per family will show this, and will also give some indication of the family's subjective perception of its economic needs.

The earnings and labor force participation of women are another measure of family income structure. In the Asian

community (not in all other communities), where families tend to be intact and female-headed families are relatively uncommon, participation in the labor force by women indicates a perception of the need for greater income at the expense of child-rearing or other "domestic" duties. High income levels for women, paradoxically, are an indicator of low welfare: women from well-to-do families tend to work shorter hours and earn less because they do not need the money. Because of widespread past and present discrimination against all women workers, their earnings are far lower than those of men; thus the longer hours of work by poor women still do not raise their family income levels by substantial amounts.

Income and labor force participation

Table 10A-10D show some measures of these quantities. The incomes of Asian men are seen to be, on the whole, lower than those for white men, although for Japanese and Korean men in Chicago and New York the differences are not great. Reference to Table 4 shows a very high percentage of foreign-born Japanese in New York. Since immigration is low, it is likely that many of these are businessmen sent from Japan, who would not, of course, face the same difficulties in earning a living as permanent residents. At this point a comparison with the incomes of black men shows that Chinese and Filipino men are no better off in their earning power in the four mainland SMSAs. Such a finding should eliminate any doubt that Asians also constitute a disadvantaged population. The important exception to these

Table 10A

Measures of income and labor force participation for Asian and white Americans (1970 Census)

Median individual income - men over 16 with income

SMSA	median annual income, in dollars, by ethnic group						
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White	Black
Chicago	8,573	5,101	6,389	--	--	8,741	6,217
Honolulu	8,252	8,114	5,654	7,292	8,510	6,210	--
Los Angeles	7,890	5,916	5,448	--	6,512	8,138	5,752
New York	8,339	4,352	6,124	--	8,220	8,092	5,667
San Francisco	7,709	5,269	5,496	--	--	8,545	5,828

Source: U.S. Census, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States
Detailed Characteristics: PC(1)-D6: California
PC(1)-D13: Hawaii
PC(1)-D15: Illinois
PC(1)-D34: New York
Negro Population, Subject Report PC(2)-1B

Median income is for persons with income only.
"White" is calculated as $Ym = \frac{Ym(aw) \times N(aw) - Ym(s) \times N(s)}{N(aw) - N(s)}$

For whites, Ym = median income, males over 14
N = no. of persons in labor force
Subscript aw = all white, subscript s = Spanish

Table 10B

Measures of income and labor force participation for Asian and white Americans (1970 Census)

Labor force participation of women over 16

SMSA	Labor force participation rates, in percent, by ethnic group					
	[illegible]	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White
Chicago	[illegible]	40.9	78.8	--	---	44.8
Honolulu	[illegible]	42.7	49.0	48.4	52.7	41.9
Los Angeles	[illegible]	41.4	63.1	--	50.3	43.7
New York	36.7	49.8	72.7	--	41.1	41.2
San Francisco	52.1	54.0	58.7	--	--	43.8

Source: U.S. Census: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States Summary Manpower Indicators

Table 10C

Measures of income and labor force participation for Asian and white Americans (1970 Census)

Median individual incomes - women over 16 with income

SMSA	median annual income in dollars, by ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White*
Chicago	3,915	3,012	5,361	--	--	3,068
Honolulu	3,788	3,632	3,034	3,157	3,448	3,151
Los Angeles	3,582	2,883	4,152	--	3,530	3,034
New York	3,962	3,143	5,950	--	4,371	3,174
San Francisco	3,687	2,575	3,635	--	--	3,403

Source: U.S. Census: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States Detailed Characteristics, series PC(1)-D

*White women - over 14

Table 10D

Measures of income and labor force participation for Asian and white Americans (1970 Census)

Number of workers per family

SMSA	Average number of workers per family by ethnic group				
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White
Chicago	1.8	1.8	2.0	--	1.7
Honolulu	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.2
Los Angeles	1.8	1.9	1.9	--	1.6
New York	1.3	1.8	1.6	--	1.6
San Francisco	1.8	1.9	1.9	--	1.6

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

generalizations is again Hawaii, where the very different ethnic makeup leads to substantially different patterns. Again it can be shown that incomes in other cities (Boston, San Diego) are extremely low for Asian men. As a consequence, Asian women work (Table 10B).

Labor force participation rates for Asian women are very high. The exceptional case - Japanese women in New York - is probably related to the peculiar age structure in this SMSA: 25% of all Japanese females there are in the prime child-rearing age of 25-34 years, while nationwide this group is only 14.2% of Japanese women. The labor force participation rate of Filipino women in Chicago and New York is remarkable. In this case, there are also many women in the age range 20-34 - but the majority of Filipino women are single and therefore, presumably, working. In the areas of family concentration - Honolulu, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, and New York for the Chinese, moderate to high female labor force participation is found.

As might be expected, incomes for Asian women are high relative to those for white women, especially for Filipinos (Table 10C). This latter observation is also in line with the apparent high number of single Filipino women, who will of course work full-time and thus earn well above the median for all women since that statistic includes many part-timers. A substantial number of Filipinas in these two cities are professionals, especially nurses, who will by the nature of their occupation receive moderately high salaries. In Honolulu, by contrast, Filipinos have the lowest earnings. Chinese women receive low pay despite their high labor-force participation.

This appears to be due to the employment of a very large number of these people in extremely low-paid occupations such as garment "sweatshops."

Table 10D necessarily follows from the previous three. Family incomes for Asians are moderate, yet pay per individual is low. Obviously, there must be more workers per family than for whites. Especially in Hawaii are the labor force participation rates high. The only exceptions occur for Japanese and Filipinos in New York, reflecting the higher educational levels and economic status of those communities. In mainland cities, the Japanese have slightly fewer workers per family than Chinese or Filipinos, but in Honolulu the situation is reversed.

Occupational status

The other common indicator of socioeconomic welfare - the rate of unemployment - also should be reconsidered. In this case, retabulation of the data by individual SMSAs does not change the situation greatly. Only Filipino males show any pattern of unemployment above whites. The point to be made here is that the social relations governing employment for Asians are substantially different from those for other groups. Asian American cultural values strongly encourage working and disapprove of unemployment. To avoid public shame, the unemployed person makes special efforts to locate a situation. Opportunities are often available, especially in areas of ethnic concentration: Chinatowns generally, and,

presumably, the Japanese and Korean sections of Los Angeles. This occurs because small business ownership is very high among Asians, except for Filipinos. Table 11A shows the number of Asian-owned business. Most of these are small firms, primarily in retailing, and many are ethnically identified or stereotyped (restaurants, gardening services, curio shops, etc.). This economic subsystem provides a source of employment for many Asians, In addition, there are particular industries, not necessarily Asian-owned, which hire large numbers of Asians. Examples are banks, hospitals, hotels, restaurants, and the garment manufacturing industry. Finally, it is often possible, especially with family financing, for persons to open their own businesses. (Lest it be thought that this is a path to riches, Table11A also shows average gross receipts for firms without employees. All costs of the business - cost of goods sold, rent, utilities, etc. - must be deducted before the proprietor can take his or her income.) Given the pressures to seek employment and the many job opportunities, particularly in ethnically-identified firms (Table 11B), it is not surprising that the Asian unemployment rate is low. Filipinos, with less access to community enterprise, show the highest rates of unemployment.

The other side of the coin, however is that these are often undesirable jobs.* Many are in services, such as waiters, busboys, dishwashers, janitors, maids, orderlies; operatives (sewing factory workers); or laborers (gardeners).

---

*Cf. Cabezas and Yee, op. cit.

Table 11A

Asian-owned businesses in 5 SMSAs, 1972

SMSA	number of firms	number of employees (excluding proprietor)	Average gross receipts (firms without employees)
Chicago	875	1,574	$17,000
Honolulu	6,755	18,907	$13,200
Los Angeles	7,403	7,814	$16,600
New York	2,119	1,210	$14,600
San Francisco	3.998	7,333	$23,600

Table 11B

SMSA	number of firms per 1000 population, by ethnicity					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipinos	Hawaiian	Korean	Undifferentiated
Chicago	--	--	--	--	--	20.5
Honolulu	26.4	26.0	9.0	5.0	19.2	--
Los Angeles	50.8	33.2	10.1	--	46.0	--
New York	10.8	23.3	4.8	--	15.9	--
San Francisco	36.5	27.0	7.4	--	22.2	--

Source: (data on firms): Bureau of the Census, Special Report MB72-3, Minority-Owned Businesses: Asian Americans, American Indians, and Others. (1972 Survey)
(population base): Summary Manpower Indicators (1970 Census)

Others are in low-level clerical jobs such as pool typists, file clerks, or keypunch operators, or sales clerks. Many higher-paid occupations such as police, firemen, skilled crafts, transport equipment operatives, salesmen or women (as opposed to mere sales clerks), and more responsible clerical jobs (secretaries) have relatively small numbers of Asian workers. Table 12 shows the percentage of each group in the low-paying,low-status occupations of laborers, service workers, private household workers, and farm workers. In most cases, a higher proportion of Asians than whites hold such jobs. For women, operative jobs are also included since, especially in New York, this is the main type of job available. Sewing factories, often described as "sweatshops", provide a low wage under often unpleasant working conditions. The sum of female low-status jobs and female operatives for Asian women exceeds that for whites in all cases except Filipinas in New York and Chicago, where the immigration of professional health workers results in a different picture. For men, only the Japanese in Chicago, Honolulu, and New York have a lower representation in low-status jobs than whites. Even here the figures may be misleading since the higher-status jobs of protective service workers (police, firemen) are included here. These account for 2.3%, 2.7%, and 3.3% of white males in Chicago, Honolulu, and New York, but presumably very much less for Asians.

Such information, coupled with the data on income and education in Tables 13-16, strongly indicates that the prob-

Table 12

Percentage of workers in low-status, low-income occupations (laborers, service workers, private household workers, farm workers; separately, female operatives)

SMSA	Ethnic group			
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	White
Chicago: male	9.6	34.0	15.5	13.1
female	12.2	17.4	7.2	13.3
female operatives	18.3	23.4	3.9	12.1
Honolulu: male	14.0	16.9	39.6	15.6
female	22.7	18.7	34.6	17.5
female operatives	10.0	8.2	16.6	2.2
Los Angeles: male	25.4	22.6	29.5	11.7
female	16.7	10.8	13.3	14.9
female operatives	16.6	25.6	13.0	8.2
New York: male	7.8	38.3	16.3	14.7
female	15.6	8.5	7.5	11.4
female operatives	7.4	43.7	3.4	10.1
San Francisco: male	26.9	27.2	43.5	13.1
female	26.1	14.0	22.5	14.1
female operatives	7.7	26.3	6.4	4.8

Source: U.S. Census, Japanese, Chinese,and Filipinos in the United States Summary Manpower Indicators

lem for Asians is underemployment, not unemployment. This condition is exhaustively documented for California by Cabezas and Yee (op.cit.) and by Wong[11/], where evidence for discriminatory hiring and assignment and low mobility is also presented. Thus the rate of unemployment is not an adequate index of the employment situation of Asian Americans.

Effects of education on income

One further factor needs to be considered. It has been a truism that education leads to better jobs and greater economic security. Perhaps nowhere has this been accepted more completely than among the Asian communities. Table 13 shows that, in general, Asians have had more years of formal education than whites and are, even so, continuing to seek education. (Again, Hawaii is the contrary example.) The extraordinarily high level of college education among Filipinos in Chicago and New York is a result of the migration of health and other professionals to those areas. Filipino women are somewhat better educated than Filipino men in all areas (Table 13B).

High mean levels of education do not tell the whole story. For Chinese and many Filipinos, there is a large group with very low educational attainment. Table 13D shows the existence of this group. In Hawaii, the fraction of poorly-educated whites is far below that of all Asian groups, while

---

11/ Harold H. Wong (thesis), The Relative Economic Status of Chinese, Japanese, Black, and White Men in California. Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

Table 13A

Educational attainment and enrollment for Asian Americans

Percent of persons 25 and over with
4 or more years of college education

SMSA	Ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White
Chicago	22.1	29.0	57.3	--	--	10.3
Honolulu	12.2	18.4	5.9	4.7	14.8	23.6
Los Angeles	16.0	28.8	30.4	--	36.7	18.6
New York	37.6	17.2	50.9	--	55.2	14.4
San Francisco	21.5	15.3	21.8	--	--	19.2

Table 13B

Percent of persons 25-34 years of age with
4 or more years of college education

SMSA		Ethnic group			
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	White
Chicago:	male	51.2	51.9	66.2	26.3
	female	28.5	38.6	71.3	16.5
Honolulu:	male	23.6	30.1	8.1	32.3*
	female	22.7	23.7	13.2	24.1*
Los Angeles:	male	34.5	52.9	33.4	25.9
	female	24.0	32.4	51.2	15.8
New York:	male	64.5	34.4	68.4	29.4
	female	35.3	22.2	70.6	20.1
San Francisco:	male	49.4	34.2	28.1	33.0
	female	28.3	22.9	36.5	24.1

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, Detailed Characteristics, Series PC(1)-D Summary Manpower Indicators

*Includes black and Spanish-American: estimated to be less than 0.5% too high

Table 13C

Percent of persons 25-34 currently enrolled in school

SMSA	Ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White
Chicago	8.9	16.8	6.4	--	--	6.4
Honolulu	6.4	8.1	3.4	3.3	10.1	7.7
Los Angeles	12.4	19.0	8.9	--	17.9	10.7
New York	7.2	9.0	7.9	--	10.6	7.4
San Francisco	13.9	13.2	7.4	--	--	10.8

Table 13D

Percent of persons 25 and over with 8 or fewer years of schooling

SMSA	Ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White
Chicago	10.8	33.4	8.4	--	--	24.4
Honolulu	23.4	22.8	45.9	24.6	19.0	9.6
Los Angeles	12.6	25.5	18.6	--	11.7	15.5
New York	13.9	46.9	17.7	--	13.4	26.9
San Francisco	13.0	39.7	27.6	--	--	14.5

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, Detailed Characteristics, Series PC(1)-D

Summary Manpower Indicators

the fraction of college graduates is much higher. It may be speculated that Asians feel more secure in the multi-ethnic setting of Hawaii and therefore are not impelled to raise their educational level in order to compete effectively.

Asians expend a great deal of effort on improving their formal education in order to compensate for the mainstream experiences which they have been denied. This is done at a considerable sacrifice of time, money, and lost earnings. How well does the effort pay off? Tables 14-16 show the earnings of Asians and whites as a function of education. To remove the influence of students and first job holders or of retired persons, the tabulation has been limited to the age range of 25-59. The data is the same in all three tables, but is rearranged to show different structural relationships. The picture is now very clear: the returns to education for Asians are substantially below those for whites, except in Hawaii. The returns for Filipinos are practically nil. White males are ahead of Asians at all levels for the four mainland cities. There is a rather consistent pattern of a medium-sized income gap between Asians and whites at the lowest educational level, a narrowing of this gap at the intermediate (high school) level, and a widening again for college graduates - in most cases exceeding the original gap. The differentials are quite large. For Asian women versus white men, the income gap is large and fairly uniform at about $5,500 for the two lower educational levels, increasing sharply to over $7,000 for the college educated. Asians do gain by increased education, but not as much as whites. Most emphatically they do not catch up;

Table 14A

Educational attainment and earnings for Asian and white Americans

Persons with 4 or more years college education

SMSA		Median annual income in dollars: males/females				
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White
Chicago:	M	10,500	9,500	6,250	--	14,408
	F	7,500	6,000	6,300	--	6,788
Honolulu:	M	12,100	14,000	7,500	13,000	11,500
	F	8,250	4,750	6,000	5,500	5,750
Los Angeles:	M	12,889	11,000	6,875	--	14,311
	F	7,357	5,500	6,250	--	7,148
New York:	M	11,625	10,437	8,000	--	14,724
	F	9,000	7,375	7,429	--	7,820
San Francisco:	M	12,111	11,167	8,000	--	13,081
	F	6,000	6,300	5,167	--	6,902

Source (Tables 14-16): U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 14B

Educational attainment and earnings for Asian and white Americans

Persons with high school to 3 years college education

SMSA		Median annual income in dollars: males/females				
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White
Chicago:	M	9,333	6,500	7,250	--	10,904
	F	5,250	5,500	8,500	--	4,646
Honolulu:	M	9,700	10,778	6,000	8,833	8,875
	F	5,524	5,792	4,833	5,200	4,750
Los Angeles:	M	9,818	7,833	7,611	--	10,465
	F	5,196	4,333	4,250	--	5,167
New York:	M	6,500	6,571	8,500	--	10,449
	F	6,250	4,400	6,500	--	5,128
San Francisco:	M	9,500	8,881	6,750	--	10,687
	F	4,937	6,079	4,722	--	5,388

Source (Tables 14-16): U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 14C

Educational attainment and earnings for Asian and white Americans

Persons with less than high school education

SMSA		Median annual income in dollars: males/females				
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White
Chicago:	M	9,500	6,000	8,000	--	9,329
	F	4,000	3,375	5,500	--	4,250
Honolulu:	M	8,722	9,250	7,000	7,929	9,000
	F	4,077	4,273	3,500	3,437	4,000
Los Angeles:	M	7,458	5,000	4,900	--	8,766
	F	3,167	2,944	4,125	--	3,834
New York:	M	4,750	4,803	6,500	--	8,640
	F	4,000	3,588	6,250	--	3,819
San Francisco:	M	8,250	5,542	7,000	--	9,047
	F	4,250	2,950	3,417	--	4,056

Source (Tables 14-16): U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 15A

Returns to education for Japanese

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment			overall gain
		less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	
Chicago:	M	9,500	9,333	10,500	1,000
	F	4,000	5,250	7,500	3,500
Honolulu:	M	8,722	9,700	12,100	2,400
	F	4,077	5,524	8,250	4,173
Los Angeles:	M	7,458	9,818	12,889	5,431
	F	3,167	5,196	7,357	4,190
New York:	M	4,750	6,500	11,625	6,875
	F	4,000	6,250	9,000	5,000
San Francisco:	M	8,250	9,500	12,111	3,861
	F	4,250	4,937	6,000	1,750

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 15B

Returns to education for Chinese

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment			overall gain
		less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	
Chicago:	M	6,000	6,500	9,500	3,500
	F	3,375	5,500	6,000	2,625
Honolulu:	M	9,250	10,778	14,000	4,750
	F	4,273	5,792	4,750	477*
Los Angeles:	M	5,000	7,833	11,000	6,000
	F	2,944	4,333	5,500	2,556
New York:	M	4,803	6,571	10,437	5,634
	F	3,588	4,400	7,375	3,787
San Francisco:	M	5,542	8,881	11,167	5,625
	F	2,950	6,079	6,300	3,350

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

*maximum income at intermediate level

Table 15C

Returns to education for Filipinos

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment			overall gain
		less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	
Chicago:	M	8,000	7,250	6,250	-1,750*
	F	5,500	8,500	6,300	800*
Honolulu:	M	7,000	6,000	7,500	500*
	F	3,500	4,833	6,000	2,500
Los Angeles:	M	4,900	7,611	6,875	1,975*
	F	4,125	4,250	5,250	1,125
New York:	M	6,500	8,500	8,000	1,500*
	F	6,250	6,500	7,429	1,179
San Francisco:	M	7,000	6,750	8,000	1,000*
	F	3,417	4,722	5,167	1,750

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

*Note irregualr patterns with all of these.

Table 15D

Returns to education for Asians (all combined)

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment: less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	overall gain
Chicago:	M	6,611	8,437	9,222	2,611
	F	3,500	5,214	6,437	2,937
Honolulu:	M	8,104	9,483	11,500	3,396
	F	3,951	5,523	7,091	3,140
Los Angeles:	M	5,937	9,071	10,075	4,138
	F	3,367	4,824	6,357	2,990
New York:	M	4,886	8,700	10,562	5,676
	F	3,682	4,400	7,500	3,818
San Francisco:	M	6,362	8,675	10,844	4,482
	F	3,071	5,243	5,906	2,835

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 15E

Returns to education for whites (non-Spanish descent)

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment			overall gain
		less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	
Chicago:	M	9,329	10,904	14,408	5,079
	F	4,250	4,646	6,788	2,538
Honolulu:	M	9,000	8,875	11,500	2,500*
	F	4,000	4,750	5,750	1,750
Los Angeles:	M	8,766	10,465	14,311	5,545
	F	3,834	5,167	7,148	3,314
New York:	M	8,640	10,444	14,724	6,084
	F	3,819	5,128	7,820	4,001
San Francisco:	M	9,047	10,687	13,081	4,034
	F	4,056	5,388	6,902	2,846

Source: Public Use Sample Tapes, Special Tabulations (See Table 14A)

*minimum at midpoint

Table 16

White-Asian income differentials as a function of educational level: persons 25-59 years old

SMSA		Difference in median annual incomes in dollars: white male minus total Asian (male/female)		
		Educational level		
		less than high school	high school - 3 yrs college	4 + yrs. college
Chicago :	M	2,718	2,467	5,186
	F	5,829	5,690	7,971
Honolulu :	M	896	- 608	0
	F	5,049	3,352	4,409
Los Angeles:	M	2,829	1,394	4,236
	F	5,399	5,641	7,954
New York :	M	3,754	1,749	4,162
	F	4,958	5,393	7,224
San Francisco:	M	2,685	2,012	2,237
	F	5,976	5,444	7,175

Source: Public Use Sample Tapes, Special Tabulations (See Table 14A)

Negative numbers mean that Asians earn more than whites in this category.

in most cases, they fall behind. The return to the investment is not large.

The income status of Asian Americans is influenced by a number of cultural factors which are not pertinent for most other ethnic groups. Unemployment is low because many Asians are willing to take substandard menial jobs (dishwasher, busboy, chambermaid, seamstress) rather than fact the stigma of unemployment. Economic substructures exist where part-time work (without fringe benefits), sub-minimum wages, or piece-work remuneration provide a downward flexibility in wages that allows for an increase in employment. In the mainstream, wages are inflexible downward so that unemployment results. Individual incomes are low: only the presence of multiple family workers makes it possible for a family to attain a reasonable (not high) income level. The returns to increased education are positive but low. The resulting picture of the economic status of Asian families is one where socioeconomic welfare is low not because of low total money income but rather because of lost leisure and delayed earnings. Even though the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter are met, gross family income is not an accurate measure of welfare. Account needs to be taken of factors such as the number of family workers, the hours worked, and the other productive opportunities foregone. Asians apparently work harder to obtain less than do whites, with probably deleterious consequences on family cohesion and stability. The other large minority groups (blacks, Hispanics) seem to respond differently to discrimina-

tion. The patterns of deprivation which these groups exhibit are all too real, but should not be taken to be the only possible expression of disadvantaged status. Federal programs to alleviate disadvantage need to consider as well the alternative forms of behavior shown by Asian Americans.

IV. Poverty

Definitions of poverty

The above should not be taken to indicate that Asians are all above the poverty line. There are many poor Asians who must rely upon public assistance or do without the usual amenities of life. The number of such persons is dependent upon the definition of poverty. The "official" index of poverty, designed by Mollie Orshansky of the Social Security Administration, is based on the Department of Agriculture's economy food plan of 1961. This plan specified quantities of eleven food groups that constituted a nutritious diet at a minimum cost. The quantities varied by the age and sex of the recipients. Thus, a matrix was developed for the minimum food needs of families of different sizes and compositions. The plan reflected, to some extent, the actual patterns of consumption among low-income persons. In 1955, the date of the survey on consumption which served as the basis for the plan, the average family spent one-third of its income on food. Since the definition of necessary quantities of commodities other than food is highly subjective, the decision was made that poverty would be three times the cost of the economy food diet. This definition persists to the present, though the figures have been adjusted in light of changes in the cost of living. It is a compromise definition, attempting to provide an objective measure of poverty, but omitting a number of important issues.

Many of these omissions are made because data is not available: a prime example is that no allowance is made for geographical residence, whereas it is well-recognized that the cost of living varies in different sections of the country. Furthermore, the relative costs of food and non-food items vary. An alternative definition of poverty uses the low-level budget developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The BLS budget is based on a mixture of prescribed standards and empirically obtained expenditures without a solid conceptual framework and is produced separately for each of the major SMSAs. It is normally much higher than the Orshansky poverty index, and thus lies at the upper level of poverty.

Poverty characteristics

Tables 17-18 show the status of Asian and white families and unrelated individuals relative to these two poverty measures. Except for Chinese and Japanese families in Honolulu, the proportion of poor Asians equals or exceeds that of whites. Japanese show the lowest rate overall. (Here again the inclusion of other SMSAs would show higher figures: 6.2% in Denver, 8.4% in Fresno, and a remarkably high 21.6% in San Diego.)

There is considerable poverty among Chinese everywhere except Honolulu. It is highest in San Francisco and New York where there are large established Chinatowns.

Filipino poverty is rather high everywhere, but especially so in Honolulu: clearly there are very sharp differences among the ethnicities there which do not parallel those found on the

TABLE 17

Proportion of Asian and white families and individuals below the poverty level in 5 SMSAs, 1970

TABLE 17A

SMSA	Percent of families in poverty, by ethnic group			
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	White
Chicago	4.2	10.3	8.0	3.8
Honolulu	3.3	5.0	10.6	8.2
Los Angeles	5.1	8.8	9.8	5.3
New York	5.8	14.1	8.2	5.3
San Francisco	5.4	10.6	9.1	4.9

TABLE 17B

SMSA	Percent of unrelated individuals in poverty, by ethnic group			
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	White
Chicago	30.0	33.1	23.3	23.4
Honolulu	32.0	37.4	30.5	23.2
Los Angeles	28.0	36.8	28.4	22.7
New York	27.9	35.7	26.6	25.7
San Francisco	28.7	37.8	32.4	22.7

Source: U.S. Census, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States

Summary Manpower Indicators

TABLE 18

Proportion of Asian and white families and individuals below the BLS lower-level budget, 1970

TABLE 18A

SMSA	Percent of families below the budget, by ethnicity					BLS budget (4 persons
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White	
Chicago	15.0	37.0	20.4	-	12.6	7500
Honolulu	17.3	21.1	32.8	28.7	26.6	8900
Los Angeles	17.0	23.4	30.3	-	17.1	7600
New York	19.0	44.7	19.4	-	16.7	7500
San Francisco	16.6	33.1	31.5	-	15.2	7900

TABLE 18B

SMSA	Percent of unrelated individuals below the BLS budget, by ethnicity					BLS budget (1 person)
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White	
Chicago	34.1	40.5	32.8	-	35.2	2700
Honolulu	47.4	43.9	47.6	51.1	39.4	3200
Los Angeles	32.6	40.8	39.7	-	37.4	2800
New York	36.8	39.5	32.4	-	36.5	2700
San Francisco	41.2	51.4	45.7	-	37.2	2900

Source: Public Use Sample Tapes, Special Tabulations

mainland. In Chicago and New York, where the small Filipino populations have a high number of professionals, poverty is somewhat lower but still far above the non-Hispanic whites. In the San Diego and Norfolk-Portsmouth (VA) SMSAs (not shown), where there are large naval installations, 22% of Filipino families are poor.

For unrelated individuals of all ethnicities everywhere the economic outlook is dim. "Poverty" is defined as an income (1969) of between $1752 and $1975, depending on age and sex. (This range is a consequence of the Orshansky definition: women and persons over 65 have lower nutritional requirements and thus the poverty limit is set lower.) With the exception of Filipinos in Chicago, however, unrelated Asians show a higher incidence of poverty than whites. Chinese are poorest everywhere; Japanese and Filipinos are roughly the same. Intercity variations are not so large here, reflecting a uniform condition of poverty for this group.

The official poverty level is extremely low. The 1970 BLS lower-level budget gives a more reasonable measure of low income (Table 18). For families of 2 persons, the poverty level is $2,469 - $2,766, (depending on the number of children), while for families of 4 they are $3,790 - $3,902 (male head under 65, non-farm). By contrast, the BLS levels derived for this report, rounded off for computational purposes, are $4,400 and $7,500 in Chicago, the lowest-cost of the five areas. Using this measure we see that from 15% to 45% of Asian families are at a low income. Japanese are tightly clustered between 15%

and 19%. Low-income Chinese are highest in Chicago, New York, and San Francisco. For Filipinos the usual pattern emerges: a lower proportion of low-income families in New York and Chicago than elsewhere. A higher percentage of Asian families than of whites is found in this category for all mainland cities. For unrelated individuals the BLS budget does not include many more persons than the poverty index. Again the pattern is fairly steady (30-50% along both ethnic and geographic lines. Use of the BLS budget rather than the poverty index does not lead to qualitative changes in the structure of the low-income population. What it shows is that, for families, this alternative measure places substantial numbers of Asian Americans in the low-income category. Two to four times more families lie between the two levels than lie below official poverty. Many Asian families, in other words, are only slightly above the poverty limits. By no stretch of the imagination can they be considered anything but economically badly off.

Utilization of public assistance

Asians who are poor often do not make use of the income supplements available. Table 19 shows the ratio of the number of families or persons who are receiving public assistance to those who are officially poor. For families the results are quite striking. Except for Honolulu, Asian families participate far less than whites in these supplementary programs. This remains true despite the wide variation by city. For

Table 19

Public assistance - poverty ratios for Asians and whites:
5 SMSAs, 1970

Table 19A

SMSA	Ratio, families receiving public assistance to families in poverty, by ethnicity			
	Japanese(s)	Chinese(s)	Filipino(s)	White
Chicago	*	*	.24	.44
Honolulu	.65	.44	.29	.33
Los Angeles	.43	.35	.69	1.02
New York	.42	.24	.42	.62
San Francisco	.86	.60	.64	1.04

Table 19B

SMSA	Ratio, unrelated individuals receiving public assistance to unrelated individuals in poverty			
	Japanese(s)	Chinese(s)	Filipino(s)	White
Chicago	1.00 (.59)	.24 (.61)	.08 (.17)	.11 (1.52)
Honolulu	.04 (.50)	.18 (.65)	.12 (.43)	.10 (.50)
Los Angeles	.12 (.65)	.22 (.31)	.09 (.50)	.37 (1.67)
New York	.28 (.83)	.22 (.59)	.12 (.24)	.18 (1.46)
San Francisco	* (.28)	.36 (.71)	.22 (.44)	.33 (1.43)

Source: Public Use Sample Tapes, Special Tabulations (Asians)
Summary Manpower Indicators (whites)

*No units receiving public assistance found in sample.
In Table 19B, the figures in parenthesis are the ratios for those receiving either public assistance or Social Security.

unrelated individuals the results are less clear. These figures, however, are clouded by the fact that many of the individuals are older persons receiving social security, which is not counted as public assistance. The inclusion of social security (figures in parentheses) shows whites to be far better off than Asians on this basis. The paucity of data precludes drawing conclusions relative to each specific ethnicity.

The reluctance of Asians to participate in public assistance programs is well known from other sources. For example, General Assistance surveys by the San Francisco Department of Social Services in July 1976 and January 1977 found 0.7% Asian clients in the latter survey and none at all in the former, despite an Asian population estimated at 20% and a poverty rate higher than the average for San Francisco at this time. Historical distrust of the government, perhaps a sense of self-reliance, and a reluctance to acknowledge publicly any economic failure seem to be the major contributors to the phenomenon. The unavailability of bilingual services may also be an important factor in some areas.

As the conclusion to this section, the social service programs of HEW may be briefly reviewed. There are nine major programs (each budgeted over $1 billion in Fiscal Year 1977). Table 20 lists these programs and their requirements for eligibility. For social security and medicare programs, age or disability and work credits are the only requirements. Some elderly Asians - either those who have immigrated re-

TABLE 20

Major Social Service Programs in the United States

Program name	Eligibility Requirements			
	aged	disabled	must be poor	other
Social Security	x			work credit
Survivors' Insurance				surviving dependents of social security recipients
Medicare (hospitalization)	x	x		
Social Security (disability)		x		
Medicaid	x	x	x	AFDC
AFDC			x	dependent children
Medicare (medical)	x	x		
Supplemental Security Income	x	x	x	maximum wealth limit
Social Services (Title XX)			x	AFDC, SSI

Source: 1976 Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

cently or those who worked in industries not covered by Social Security - may lack the necessary work credits. However, there is no evidence at this time that the work credit requirement impinges differentially on Asian Americans in comparison with other groups. With these programs the principal danger is that Asians may not utilize them. Outreach and bilingual services would seem to be the needs in this area.

The other large programs - AFDC, SSI, Medicaid, and Title XX Social Services - all set limitations on family income and wealth for eligible applicants. Here it would be expected that Asians will be differentially excluded from participation. AFDC and SSI are direct income supplements for which such exclusion may be supportable. However, the Title XX and Medicaid programs, which provide other services, might well have their eligibility definitions expanded to cover the situations detailed earlier in this paper. There are a number of smaller social service programs (if a half-billion dollar program can be described as small) which appear to have a similar bias in their eligibility requirements. Among these may be listed Family Health Centers (for underseverved communities), Head Start and Follow Through (low-income children), the WIN program (childcare and support, and training for AFDC parents), Family Planning Services, ESEA Title I (educationally deprived children, the College Work-study Program, Direct Student Loans, the Trio program (Upward Bound, Talent Search, Special Services for Disadvantaged (high school and college students), the Teacher Corps, and, in general, any program providing services or as-

sistance preferentially to low-income families or communities. There are, of course, programs outside of HEW with this same focus: among them may be listed Food Stamps and other food programs, the domestic programs of ACTION, public housing, general assistance, Model Cities,and other community-development programs, and the Job Corps. When applications are made for grants under such programs for groups within the Asian community it often becomes necessary to propound detailed justifications for the inclusion of Asians as "disadvantaged" in order to qualify for assistance. More sophisticated indicators of disadvantage which take into account the special characteristics of the Asian family will help to rectify the imbalance in services provided at present to the Asian community.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

What conclusions can be drawn from this study on the question of HEW, or other governmental,programs to serve Asian Americans? HEW programs are, in general, intended to serve disadvantaged populations. For the allocation of funds, particular statistical measures are used to determine eligibility. Unemployment and poverty are two of the most widely used of such indicators. However, as we have seen, neither captures very well the true condition of the Asian American family.

A greatly oversimplified picture of the reaction of minority groups to discrimination is this: Most minorities perceive that discrimination will prevent them from succeeding and drop out of the system. They develop low levels of skills and consequently experience difficulty in finding employment. Blacks, especially, frequently have broken families. The persons for this appear to be partly historical and partly a consequence of the regulations of the welfare system. Hispanic women enter the labor at a lower rate, both because of higher childbearing rates and cultural sactions. All of these groups are primarily employees in firms owned and managed by middle-class whites. These patterns are familiar to planners and are rightly taken account of in the design of programs. Among the consequences are high unemployment, low family income, low educational levels, and many broken families.

Asians, by contrast, display a quite different pattern. As a response to their disadvantaged condition they increase their efforts to gain an education. (This education, it might be added, is often in the wrong skills: it tends to be academically oriented with emphasis on mathematics or science. Effective communication and analytic thinking are frequently overlooked.) Employment is usually available, since, unlike the other minorities, small business ownership is commun among Japanese and Chinese, and there is a natural tendency to hire from within the community. In some areas, substandard wage scales are allowed to exist; many of these are elastic enough to allow adding more workers as long as the real wage keeps dropping. Furthermore, several family members work: wives, other relatives, children. Many workers at a low wage still bring family incomes to moderate levels.

Compared to whites, then, Asians work more and earn less. Even for persons with the same educational backgrounds Asians earn less. The measures of poverty do not capture the very real loss of economic welfare for the family which makes extraordinary sacrifices to send its children to college, and then sees those sons and daughters still treated unequally. HEW and other agencies need to broaden the definition of "disadvantaged" to include this situation. Although these are at best statistical simplifications excluding many individuals, it can be generalized that where other discriminated - against groups expend the same efforts as whites and earn less (or, from discouragement, reduce their effort and gain less still), Asians exert a higher level of effort than without fully catch-

ing up. While both the extra education and the higher degree of employment do have positive effects, Asians still do measurably less well than whites with comparable levels of education and effort. Their jobs are often menial or dead-ended (Cabezas and Yee, 1977). Paths of advancement are not open. Discriminatory practices, historical oppression, and a traditional emphasis on modesty and respect for others combine to maintain the Asian American family outside of - and below - mainstream America despite their otherwise excellent qualifications. A recognition of this subtle form of disadvantage by HEW officials will allow the development of policies and procedures to include Asian Americans in programs to alleviate the effects of generations of mistreatment by the majority population.

Recommendations for further study:

1. Construction of socioeconomic indicators appropriate for the Asian American population.
2. Characterization of the differences among Asian American groups.
3. Research on the education/work/income relationships for Asians.
4. Research on the motives for selecting career paths by Asians.
5. Research on educational policy for Asians, with regard to both optimum strategies and pertinent academic areas.

6. Study of family income, education, and expenditure patterns.
7. Determination of the cost of 100% participation by all eligible Asians in public assistance programs, and measurements of the benefits foregone at lower participation rates.
8. Determination of the public assistance costs if present conditions lead to the increased disintegration of Asian American families.
9. Outreach and education programs to Asians on their eligibility for public assistance benefits.
10. Investigation of cultural identification and acceptance for children with one Asian and one non-Asian parent.

ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

The purpose of this paper is to present information about Pacific and Asian American families and to suggest HEW policies which might be more effective in helping this group. Because of the lack of empirical data and research studies (a program priority that should rank high for funding), much of the material will be in the realm of opinions, conjecture, limited observations and personal experiences. The limitations of these approaches are all too familiar to this audience, so I will not need to discuss these any further.

Pacific and Asian Americans

The term Pacific and Asian American covers a number of diverse groups. There are the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Samoans, Pilipinos, Vietnammese, Guamanians as well as other groups. So there are nationality and cultural differences as well as differences in terms of time and motives of immigration to the United States; the area of settlement; their reception by the host culture; their size and other demographic factors; their "needs," their problems and their adaptations. Further there are also many within group differences (age, generation, social class, education, personality) as well as the between group differences so that generalizations will have to be modified with these variables in mind.

Asian Americans: Problem Free?

A current stereotype of Asian Americans is that of "problem free" groups. Although the present perception is a welcome change from historical Asian stereotypes ("vile scum of the earth"), the notion that they are devoid of problems may be as damaging as the old ones which emphasized only the negative. For it may mean that many Asian American families may be ignored when they are in need, or that the information and counsel necessary to cope with the complexity of modern day life is not available. It is also conceivable that many of the "old world" ways brought over by Asian immigrant groups could exacerbate stresses and tensions for their progeny, who have been exposed to education and life in modern America.

But why are Asians considered problem free? One criteria for validating this prescription is the seeming lack of Asian Americans asking for help from governmental and social agencies. They seldom use psychological clinics, family counseling centers and social service agencies. However, Miranda and Kitano (1976) point out that the problem may be related more to the "service delivery" organizations than to the lack of problems in third world communities. For example mental health services are generally fragmented (e.g. referrals, specialists) whereas Asian Americans often prefer seeing one professional who will carry the client throughout the whole process. Or many agencies do not have bi-cultural and bi-lingual personnel and most of the therapeutic and counseling models are based on white middle-class populations. So where there may be an Asian American style of interaction which is indirect and inferential, the professional

may demand direct, "letting it all hang out" communication styles. Further many social service facilities are inaccessible, both on the physical and psychological levels for Asians and they are not accountable to Asian American communities. There is also the lack of training facilities for Asian professionals, and finally there are very few agencies which are staffed and run by Asian Americans. Therefore it comes as no surprise that not many Asian Americans utilize the traditional agencies and when they do, they often drop out after the first visit (Sue and McKinney, 1975).

It should also be noted that most immigrants from Asia have had different kinds of "health and welfare" experiences from their European counterparts (the same is no doubt true about immigrants from Mexico and South America); yet there is little understanding and use of these factors when designing programs for these populations. I am currently conducting preliminary research on the social welfare systems of Japan and Taiwan and I hope to have some findings soon.

But when there are appropriate programs, there is use. For example, Little Tokyo Towers in Los Angeles, a housing project for elderly Japanese is filled and has a long waiting list; the counselling program funded by the Los Angeles Japanese Chamber of Commerce using a bi-lingual, bi-cultural social worker has a steady stream of clients. A related area, that of medical-dental and optometrical services suffers no lack of Asian patients. It is important to note that many of those delivering the services are of Asian American descent. It should also be noted that many Asians are enrolled in voluntary hospital plans such as Kaiser so that there are models upon which successful programs

can be delivered to Asian Americans. A good research project will be to compare those programs which are apparently successful in drawing significant numbers of Asian American families with those programs that do not. I suspect that there are dimensions of "culture;" of special needs, of financing and of the way the services are publicized and delivered.

Vulnerable Groups

There are special groups among Asian Americans that are especially in need of services. One of the most obvious are the elderly - - many of them do not know the language and are unfamiliar with the ways of the majority. The idea of spending their last years in retirement homes will be difficult at best. Differences in food and life styles would dictate separate ethnic facilities, but problems of costs and priorities (plus the very small numbers in certain Asian groups and the tendency of taking care of problems within the family) often preclude such programs. We all know of Asian families who struggle to take care of grandparents, often because they feel as if they have no other options. The same is also true of dependent children - - Asian styles often mean that unmarried children remain in the home. Some form of tax relief might be helpful in these instances.

Another special group are the interracially married couples and their mixed-blood children. Problems of identity and bi-cultural socialization are being faced by large numbers as interracial marriage increases (Kikumura and Kitano, 1976). Then there are the new Asian immigrants such as the Vietnnamese refugees; the college trained Koreans and Pilipinos settling for jobs considerably below their education, and

the Pacific Islanders, each bringing a number of different populations with different problems. They are arriving at a time when services are being cut and when jobs are scarce. Other problems are societal and not necessarily limited to Asians. The role of professional child care services; school desegregation; educational opportunity; role of TV; marital counseling; rising rates of separation and divorce; changes in dating and marital styles; problem behavior such as runaways and drug use and generational differences are issues which must be faced by all.

Asian American Families

This section will provide information on Japanese families. Some of the generalizations may also be appropriate to other Asian families. The information is based on an article titled "The Japanese American Family" (Kitano and Kikumura, 1976). It should be noted that what is described is primarily on families in Japan and that time, acculturation and urbanization have altered many of these practices and it will be up to the reader to intelligently assess these changes.

a. Structure

The Japanese family (as is their society) is much more "vertical" in structure than the more "horizontal" American system. Therefore there is a recognition of more powerful people, ascribed roles and stronger positions, in contrast to the American ideal of more egalitarian relationships. (It should also be noted that in actual practice, there may not be that much of a difference between the two cultures). In the family, the father is on top, followed by male children,

by female children and then by the mother. A number of norms are available to reinforce the vertical relationships such as oyabun-kobun (parent to child); enryo (deference) and amae (dependence). There are language forms to address those above and those below one in status; Japanese socialization emphasizes adaptation and conformity to the vertical structure. It is difficult to assess exactly how the norms and family structures have been modified through time and acculturation in the United States, although it would be safe to say that the older immigrant Japanese (The Issei) are the most familiar with these practices.

Knowledge of the vertical orientation is important since decision making and other important facets of family life are tied to the vertical orientation. Historically, those lower in the scale, including family members seldom make individual decisions without prior consultation and counsel from those in more powerful positions.

b. Frame Orientation

The Japanese anthropologist, Chie Nakane (1970) sees the Japanese social structure in terms of "frames." The family unit ("ie") and the place of employment are examples of such frames and belonging to one frame often means a lifetime commitment. Assistance and problem solving take place within the frame so that those outside the structures are not usually called in to help. Terms like "the family will take care of their own;" " one's employer is obligated to help" recognize

the importance of the various frames and the difficulty in the Japanese systems for asking and receiving assistance from "outsiders," including professionals.

There is some carryover of this system among Japanese in the United States and other Asian groups. For example, among Samoans, there are chiefs and tribal units which can be likened to a frame orientation and that knowledge of the vertical structure and the frames are important when dealing with this group. Among the Japanese there are "ken" (prefecture of state) organizations and other friendship and social groupings which at times provides the Japanese individual with his then primary identification.

c. Loyalty, Duty and Obligation

Strong norms in the Japanese family include those of loyalty, duty and obligation. Many Japanese families are held together by these variables, rather than the American bonding pattern based on love and affection. One seldom hears a mother appealing to a Japanese child on the basis of "if you love me" and many Issei marriages were held together by loyalty, duty and obligation. The very low rates of separation and divorce based on this model may be contrasted to the very high rates which accompany relationships built primarily on love and affection. However, this variable has probably changed the most so that the modern day Japanese American follows love and affection as religiously as his American peer.

d. Communication Styles

There are a number of topics subsumed under this category. One is the indirect styles of communication which are an integral part of the Japanese style. Direct statements, confrontation, challenges and the like are not a normal part of Japanese interaction. The indirect style is also brought into being when asking for assistance so that it is relatively easy to ignore or to dismiss the "cry for help" of the Japanese. As we say:

> "Socialization into the Japanese culture takes into account the art of deflection and the avoidance of direct confrontation ... rather than ... the more powerful parent against the child ("You do what I say, or else"), the Japanese parent is more apt to use indirect techniques. They may bring in a diversionary stimulus or attempt to bring abait cooperation ..." (Kitano and Kikumura, 1973; P. 53.)

Problem behavior often remains "hidden" among the Japanese. In a recent study (in progress) on alcoholism, both Japanese and Chinese respondents answered that they would not admit to the alcoholism of family members. Most would prefer to keep the problem hidden. There was the feeling of bringing shame to the family.

These examples form as a reminder that the needs and problems of Asian American families should be addressed.

A number of generalizations for program planners may be made. The Federal Government, in dealing with Asian American families is focussing on a group with a high degree of literacy and communication skills, so that information about programs and policies will have good effect if

conducted correctly. This might mean the use of ethnic newspapers, local television (i.e. Los Angeles has a station that runs many Asian programs), and local community resources. It might also mean a bi-lingual approach. Owan (1975) has successfully used the bi-lingual approach to bring better social security services to a group of China-town residents. But it should be remembered that Asian Americans have highly acculturated families so that information can also be gained from more regular sources.

Similarly, the kinds of programs should cover a wide spectrum. For some, an all ethnic resource such as Little Tokyo Towers is desirable; yet there are others who would prefer a more integrated setting. Similarly, there may be those who prefer a bi-lingual, bi-cultural worker, while others may prefer a well trained skilled worker of whatever nationality.

The most appropriate generalization is that there should be no single program for Asian American families, with the assumption that all Asian Americans would willingly attend. Rather, there should be a variety ranging from one that carefully addresses the values and life styles of Asian cultures to one that is based on purely American models.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Kikumura, Akemi and Kitano, Harry "Interracial Marriage: A Picture of the Japanese Americans," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 29, 2, pp. 67-81, 1973.

2. Kitano, Harry and Kikumura, Akemi. "The Japanese American Family" in Ethnic Families in America, ed. by Charles Mindel and Robert Habenstein, New York: Elsevier, pp. 41-60.

3. Miranda, Manuel and Kitano, Harry. "Mental Health Services in Third World Communities," International Journal of Mental Health, Vol. 5, 2, pp. 39-49, 1976.

4. Nakane, Chie. Japanese Society, Berkeley: University of California, 1970.

5. Sue, Stanley and McKinney, H. "Asian Clients in the Community Mental Health Services," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45 (1), 111.

6. Owan, Tom

PUBLIC POLICY RESPONSES TO THE HEALTH NEEDS OF PACIFIC/ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

- by -

Jerry L. Weaver

School of Government and Public Administration

American University

B-118 179

PUBLIC POLICY RESPONSES TO THE HEALTH NEEDS OF
PACIFIC/ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

There are three factors which must be taken into account in any discussion of the Pacific/Asian American population: diversity, ignorance, and change. Without a clear recognition of how these factors affect our understanding of Pacific and Asian Americans, no useful discussion of health conditions is possible. For example, while the concept "Pacific/Asian American" is an improvement over the stereotype-laden "Oriental," it is misleading because it conceals the heterogenity of the peoples subsumed under it. In fact, the various communities which have their roots in the Pacific/Asian basin are as diverse and unique, perhaps even more so, as are the nationa of Europe. The Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Indonesian, Guamanian, Pilipino, Samoan, Vietnamese, and Thai peoples, and their neighbors from South Asia (Indians, Pakistanis, Bangalis, and Sri Lankans) each have an ancient heritage, rich culture, and unique social institutes. Indeed, there are important subnational differences which separate groups within each national population: the Philippines containing dozens of ethnolinguistic communities which manifest major differences even as immigrants in the United States.

This tremendous diversity makes talking about the "Pacific/Asian American family" both impossible and wrongheaded: there is no single familial organization common to the Pacific/Asian American population; hence there can be no unitary set of programs or policies to strengthen or perserve the family as a social institution. For instance, an extended family composed of both several generations (a vertical family) and many grades of blood and marraige relatives (a horizontal family) is quite common in the Guamanian community. Japanese, however, much more frequently are members of nuclear families which have far less interaction beyond primary members. Most of the over 120,000

IndoChinese refugees who entered the U.S. in 1975/1976 have only fragments of families, if any at all, in the United States. Similarly, but with important differences, many Chinese are separated from family members - a condition which is especially onerous for elderly Chinese who have no relatives around them. Then there is the Pacific/Asian who has married outside the community. This variation of the "Pacific/Asian family" is often beset by particular problems which call for special assistance and bicultural providers because the Pacific/Asian member may be a woman, typically a "war bride," with emotional and mental health problems which may not be recognized by herself or conventional health care providers.

Given the diversity of the population, it is no wonder that very little is known about the health problems and behavior of Pacific/Asian Americans. Much of the available literature is based on tiny samples from which little socioeconomic control data have been obtained. Important exceptions to this rule are the massive studies of heart disease and cancer among Japanese and, to a lesser extent, Chinese. Yet it would be foolhardy to generalize these epidemiological findings to other communities. Of equal significance to the development of a clear picture of health problems is the absence of research into drug abuse, mental health, dietary determinants of disease, and other problems found in various Pacific/Asian American communities. Data either are not collected (a research error of omission), or are reported by misleading category ("Asian": a bookkeeping, administrative error of commission). One cannot attack problems when they are not described precisely.

Similarly, outreach programs, health education, and the provision of facilities and providers are all hampered by a lack of information about the health care behavior of different elements of the larger communities. We have some information that Japanese women respond to health problems differently than do Japanese men of similar socioeconomic characteristics; others tell us that working-class Pilipinos differ in remedial behavior from professional Pilipinos; and personal observation suggests that younger Japanese of the Sansei and Yonsei generations (second and third generation American born) have attitudes about illness and disease which differ significantly from those of their grandparents. But there is very little solid examination of gender, cohort, and class variations in health problems and behavior upon which to build coherent, responsible public policy.

Finally, into this welter of ill-defined problems we must add another element: rapid change. Until 1965, the Pacific/Asian American communities grew very slowly. The three oldest communities (Japanese, Chinese and Pilipino) were largely urban and restricted to the West Coast (the sizeable Chinatowns in New York and Boston being the principle exceptions). But the 1965 changes in the immigration law plus growing political unrest in the Philippines, IndoChina and Korea, brought hundreds of thousands of new immigrants. As Table 1 reveals, over one million Asian immigrants arrived "officially" between 1965-76; others who were not enumerated may underrepresent the true total by a significant amount. In addition, many Guamanians and Samoans journeyed to the mainland, particularly after 1970, in search of jobs and to reunite families. The Japanese Community alone has experienced no appreciable growth through immigration.

Table 1

Immigration to the United States
(FY 1965-1976)

	Total 1965-1976	Percent Increase 1976 over 1965
China & Taiwan	200,216	364.0
Hong Kong	49,480	709.8
India	118,258	2904.6
Korea	168,914	1322,8
Philippines	276,171	1091.1
Asia Total	1,144,120	624.6
Europe	1,139,579	36.2
North America (including Mexico)	1,634,774	12.3
South America	238,614	26.7
Africa	67,115	128.3
Oceania	32,027	137.5

Source: Computed from data supplied by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

This post-1965 tidal wave has increased greatly the long-established Korean, Chinese and Pilipino populations, and has created new communities: Thai, Lao, Vietnamese, Indian. The majority of newcomers are young, relatively well-educated, and female: except among Indian immigrants, women outnumber men. (See Table 2.) Securing jobs, housing, quality education and other basic human needs are and will continue to be major problems for many of these newcomers whether they have established communities to help them or not.

Most came expecting professional or technical jobs; but because of licensing problems, inadequate English skills, and the general stagnation of the American economy in the middle 1970s, there is widespread underemployment and high unemployment which stimulate mental and physical health difficulties. Many Koreans, for example, have turned to retail businesses, often "mom and pop" stores, and are able only to eke out the barest subsistance from 12-16 hours of work, seven days per week.

Acculturation as a Guide to Problems

While some of the health problems which Pacific and Asian peoples suffer are unique to particular communities (for instance, Chinese men have a highly disproportionate frequency of nasopharynx cancer and Japanese women are reported to suffer nearly four times the frequency of stomach cancer as do Anglo women), health concerns are often associated with age cohorts. Stomach cancers are far more often found among the older Japanese than the younger; drug abuse is more frequent among younger than older Japanese -- although alcoholism is found more frequently among middle-aged males.

Table 2

Female Immigrants from the Pacific/Asian Basin
(FY 1976)

	Women as a Percent of All Immigrants	Percent of Total Female Immigration by Cohors				
		19 or younger	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 and older
China & Taiwan	52.4	15.7	35.8	16.3	11.9	20.2
Hong Kong	50.5	64.9	26.8	4.3	1.9	2.0
India	48.2	21.9	49.9	17.2	4.5	6.5
Korea	61.1	40.0	36.1	13.6	4.7	5.6
Philippines	60.0	22.9	32.9	17.3	5.5	21.3
Asia Total	55.6	29.1	36.5	15.7	6.4	12.3

Source: See Table 1.

The generation-specific nature of many health problems suggests that while age itself is related to illness and disease, so are diet and life style. That is, older Japanese who experience the highest frequency of stomach cancer also more often eat traditional Japanese meals which contain pickled vegetables, smoked fish, and other substances found to be associated with cancer. On the other hand, heart disease is much less prevalent among the more traditional, perhaps because their diet is low in animal fats; or because first generation immigrants not only eat "simpler" foods, they also are more likely to be manual laborers: their more Americanized sons and daughters have discovered steaks and french fries and have entered professional and administrative (low exercise) occupations.[1/]

Since level of education, English language skills, occupation, diet and other cultural practices are subsumed under the rubric acculturation, and since acculturation ("Americanization") is fairly closely associated with age, we may be able to gain some insights into the health problems of Pacific/Asian American families if we look at specific cohorts. In doing so, however, we must be sensitive to the differences within given cohorts which exist among the several communities which are the focus of our concern: 25 year old Yonsei have few problems in common with a newly arrived Korean or Samoan peer, even if they share objectively the same class identity (which few do).

The Elderly

There are many methodological problems to be recognized in analyzing data from minority communities: language barriers, representativeness of samples, under/over reporting, changes brought about by recent explosive growth, and so forth. These caveats are especially germane to the consideration of Asian

aged. Because of a history of discrimination and persecution at the hands of public authorities, limited English, and fear of becoming involved with agents of the government, census and other data may overreport the more affluent, better informed, more acculturated segment of the population. Therefore, caution is in order, since the true condition of many Pacific and Asian elderly could be more acute than aggregate data suggest. 2/

While the proportion of elderly has declined in most Pacific and Asian communities, the actual size of the older cohort is large and growing larger. For example, in 1976 nearly 15% of Chinese and Pilipino immigrants were 60 years or older. 3/ Presumably, most of these seniors are entering the United States with other family members or to join previous migratory relatives. However, there is a sizeable number of elderly who live alone, often in the decaying parts of New York, San Francisco, Boston and Los Angeles. Among Chinese and Pilipinos, the aged are disproportionally men: 57% and 82% of the 65 and older cohorts, respectively. This gender imbalance reflects the twin impacts of federal Asian exclusionary acts which limited the immigration of women and legislation in California and other states which prohibited Asians from marrying non-Asians.

Arriving in the U.S., the Chinese found work; wealth, however, eluded most of them. Once the Western railroads were built (many Chinese accompanied the expansion of railroads into Mexico and Central America where their progeny are found today in villages and cities) and the growers had replaced them with cheaper, more docile field hands, most Chinese moved to marginal service occupations such as the ubiquitous handlaundry and restaurant. Long hours,

low wages, and little or no residential sanitation, recreation or health services were the lot of tens of thousands. It is not surprising, therefore to find currently that 28% of all Chinese elderly live below the federal poverty standard: in urban areas such as New York City the figure is nearly 40%.[4/]

The diseases and disabilities of urban poverty are stamped on the morbidity profile of the elderly Chinese: high rates of respiratory disorders, dental disease, TB, diabetes, hypertension. In addition, mental illness is common: suicide rates among the pioneer generation (Idai) far exceed those of Anglos and comparable Chinese populations in Hong Kong and Singapore. One observer concludes: "The high Idai's (age-adjusted standardized mortality ratios) and particularly the much elevated rate for persons aged 55 years and over seems to reflect the miserable life of these foreign-born aged Chinese, as characterized by isolation, loneliness, destitution, ill-health, and perhaps loss of status."[5/]

Studies of mental hospitals and institutions indicate that Chinese patients often are older males. Their pathologies tend to be more acute, particularly in the areas of retardation, exclusiveness, level of care required, and psychotic disorganization, than other Asian patients. Apparently the gravity of these pathologies is related to the unwillingness or inability of elderly males to admit their problem and accept assistance.[6/]

The sociocultural aspects of aged Chinese health problems is suggested by Gaw when he writes: "...in a society where the care of the elderly is traditionally a part of the family system, single elderly Chinese men without

family support face unique difficulties during retirement. This problem is even more intensified in Chinatown, which is not prepared to absorb the increasing number of retired men and where facilities and resources for the elderly are virtually non-existent." 7/

While some Japanese came to the U.S. early in the 20th century as contract agricultural workers, other immigrated to establish commercial ventures. When it became clear that business and the professions were closed to them, most Japanese turned to farming or fishing. Using a provision of the immigration law which permitted Japanese to bring in their wives, thousands of men acquired previously unseen spouses ("picture brides") from their home districts. The new husbands were often in their late twenties, thirties or even older, but most of the brides were teenagers. Now many of the husbands have died and there are thousands of elderly widows in the Japanese community -- 2/3rds of the over 65 cohort are women.

Although most male Issei (pioneers) learned some English and became active economically in the broader American society, Issei -- and to a large extent Nisei (first American born) -- women more frequently remained marginally acculturated and unassimilated into American social institutions. Thus many now-elderly Japanese women offer a particular challenge to health providers because of their limited English fluency, preference for Japanese social and cultural traditions (such as diet), and, often, residential isolation in neighborhoods from which their more affluent friends and family have moved.

Other barriers to institutional care include absence of social security coverage, lack of information about public providers, and preference for hard-to-find

Japanese health care providers. Underutilization of existing services is another problem as revealed in a 1968 survey of 131 Issei living in Los Angeles' Little Tokyo. Of those who were enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid, only 30% and 23%, respectively, indicated that they used available benefits. And nearly 25% of those eligible for Medicare were not enrolled.[8/] A study in 1976 found that only 2% of a random sample of Japanese compared with 13.4% of the overall Los Angeles population was enrolled in Medicare.[9/]

Unlike the Japanese community which has experienced no influx of migrants, the Pilipino population is booming -- it grew by 90% between 1960 and 1970, and 276,000 immigrants have arrived during 1965-1976. While some elderly are immigrants, most are the long-established "sacadas" -- the survivors of the 50,000 Pilipinos who were recruited in the 1920's and 1930's to work in the fields and packing sheds of Hawaii and the mainland.[10/] After a life in migratory labor or cannery work, few of the sacada have the savings for a comfortable retirement: 25% of the elderly live in poverty, often in rundown residential hotels in San Francisco, Seattle, Sacramento or San Pedro. a lucky handful have moved into retirement settlements such as the United Farm Workers' "Agbayani Village" in Delano, California, where they enjoy a many-faceted nonpaternalistic program. However, the vast majority of sacadas live alone or with other elderly bachelors -- in 1970, only 18% of those 65 years and older were women.[11/]

Whether members of a functioning family or living alone, most of the Pacific and Asian elderly are only marginally acculturated and assimilated into the dominant institutions of American society: Senator Hayakawa is as unrepresentative of his Asian peers as Thurgood Marshall is of the elderly Black

population. This does not mean, however, that all elderly Pacific and Asian Americans live in poverty, isolation and misery. Some do; but depending on the community, many have viable social, cultural and economic relationships, often with members of their primary families. Nevertheless the vast majority have only a limited ability to interact successfully with Anglo hospitals, doctors, nursing home operators, and so forth. Language is a major barrier; so is money. These two factors form massive obstacles to obtaining the basic needs of many elderly Pacific and Asian Americans.[12/]

Because few families can bear the cost of prolonged, high-quality nursing care, many ill or distressed elderly do not receive adequate attention. Part of the problem is the absence of suitable facilities: those institutions which offer culturally compatible environments are either too expensive or too crowded. For those who are not infirmed, wanting to be self-reliant often keeps them from seeking public assistance or turning to their children. With inflation reducing their already meager savings and creating an added strain on the budgets of many Pacific and Asian-American families, the final years for many elderly are a time of despair, pain, and anguish.

The Middle-Aged

The segment of the Pacific/Asian population between 35 and 60 years of age has a complex set of health problems. But before moving to broad generalizations, it should be noted that this cohort is also the most variegated by salient sociocultural features. Within the Japanese community, there is a

fairly high level of both acculturation and assimilation. In the internment camps it became clear that a knowledge of English and a familiarity with American institutions were useful skills -- those who possessed them quickly displaced the traditional Issei as community leaders. After the war, this new stratum led the movement of Japanese into business and the professions. Thus the concentration camp's experience was a stimulus for acculturation which in turn opened the door to wider economic, social and political contacts with the dominant society.

Most of the Nisei who compose the overwhelming majority of the present 35-60 year old cohort were able to take advantage of the post-War relaxation of anti-Asian barriers to education and employment and fashioned economically successful careers outside of the traditional Japanese community. This cohort is now the backbone of the relatively affluent Japanese community. At the same time, however, the Nisei population is afflicted with multiple health problems: alcoholism, hypertension, psychosomatic complaints, and mental illness. These problems stem in large part from the tremendous stress they and their parents place on educational and economic success.13/

The 35-60 Chinese age cohort is much more diversified than the Japanese in levels of acculturation and assimilation. This variation reflects the immigration to the U.S. of overseas Chinese. Also the most traditional elements of the Chinese community who have retained power and prestige longer than their counterparts among the Japanese have perpetuated communal institutions and practices which restrain members from integrating with the broader American society. Consequently, alongside economically well-off lawyers, physicians, engineers and business people are kinspersons who barely speak English, and who are kept in a state of perpetual exploitation because of the low wages

paid them by employers who know that they are undocumented and therefore are vulnerable to the threat of being denounced to the authorities and deported from the United States.[14/]

Those Chinese who live in Chinatown slums face all sorts of environmental health rises: TB, for example, is reported to be a hundred times more prevalent in Chinatowns than elsewhere in the metropolis -- a datum which may stir latent anti-Chinese or anti-Asian emotions because it fails to put the nature of the problem in perspective: 30 cases per 10,000 Chinese compared with 3 cases per 10,000 in the overall population. A significant number of Chinatown residents seem to be virtually isolated from the broader society: a report from New York City states that it is not unlikely for a person who has lived for 30 to 40 years in Chinatown never to have been beyond its [15/] boundaries. As we noted in the discussion of the elderly, poverty plus isolation may breed multiple pathologies for both single people and family members. [16/]

Many of the 276,000 Pilipinos and 168,000 Koreans who have immigrated since 1965 are among the 35-60 year old cohort and they differ in some important respects from American-born Pilipinos or Koreans of the same generation. For example, the majority of American-born, middle-aged Pilipinos are either unskilled or semiskilled industrial workers or followers of maritime or agricultural occupations. Most of the newcomers, however, are technicians or professionals -- a sizeable number of Pilipino immigrants are health care providers. Little is known about the health problems (or anything else, for that matter) of the middle-aged Pilipino and Korean cohorts. There have been some studies of the mental health of Pilipinos, but they are inconclusive.[17/]

From conversations with social workers, representatives of the Pilipino and Korean communities, and scattered newspaper accounts, I have the impression that there may be a good deal of stress and emotional upheaval within the two groups. Many of those who arrived expecting technical and professional employment have been disappointed: one hears stories of physicians, engineers and pharmacists working as storekeepers and gas station attendants. Unemployment of American-born Pilipinos in California is reportedly high because agribusinesses have become more machinized, the maritime industry is in decline, and blue-collar employment is generally scarce. I suspect that economic difficulties, long hours of unfulfilling labor plus frustrated ambitions weigh heavily on both short and long term residents.

Japanese, Korean and Pilipino war brides form a special sector of the 35-60 year old cohort. As mentioned above, there is very little information about the health needs and family relations of these women. But some may share the unhappy fate of their young sisters.

Young Adults

The 18-34 year old cohort is probably the most acculturated and assimilated element of the Japanese, Pilipino, Chinese and Korean communities. Even those who have arrived recently from Asia are usually better versed in English and American ways (thanks to television and American impact on school curriculae) than older immigrants. Native born or immigrant, this cohort is rapidly Americanizing: rates of divorce, suicide, drug abuse and other "indicators of acculturation" are approaching national levels. A good deal of this wastage must be laid at the feet of the traditional community

leaders who for a long time denied that Asians were not "model Americans." Because spokespersons during the 1960s perpetuated the belief that the "community takes care of its own" and ignored many of the problems of their teenagers, educational programs and other forms of support for young people were not undertaken. Happily f the generation of the 1970s, a more enlightened attitude is apparent among community leaders who realize now that self-destructive, antisocial behavior is not going to go away. Nonetheless, there remains little exploration of the range of physical and mental health problems suffered by the young adult cohort.

While Japanese, Chinese and Pilipino young adults are usually second or third generation American residents, their peers of the IndoChinese, South Asian and Pacific Islander communities may be experiencing a difficult time adjusting to their new surroundings. Some of this cohort, nobody knows how many, are unable to find anything except occasional, badly-paying employment; consequently they and their families live in substandard housing, suffer from inadequate nutrition, and are unable to utilize available health services. In Washington, D.C., for example, one encounters South Asians who report that several families totaling 12-15 persons live together in a single one-bedroom apartment. Similarly, Guamanian and Samoan young adults often move in with relatives so that small houses or apartments become overcrowded.

These living arrangements reflect the newcomers' need for some semblance of social and cultural continuity in a foreign environment; also, however, licensure laws, the absence of bicultural personnel in social service agencies, failure of the educational system to retain and prepare Pacific and Asian students, the high cost of medical care, as well as other features of the

American society, combine to create formidable barriers to self-sufficiency. The history of other immigrant populations recounts similar economic difficulties and problems with securing decent, healthy working and living conditions. Now it is the duty of public and private agencies to ease the passage from stranger to full participant as quickly as possible. In so doing, many of the environmental and communicable disease and health risks faced by recent immigrants can be reduced substantially.

Among the young adults, war brides or "partners in international marriages" stand out as a particularly threatened group. Many of these young women, like their sisters who earlier left Japan and Korea, had only limited education and marginal experience with American culture prior to arriving in the United States. Although the majority may have adapted reasonably well to their new surroundings, a fairly large number turn up in the offices of psychiatrists, psychiatric social welfare workers, mental health programs and the like with such problems as broken marriages, nervous breakdowns, suicide attempts, and drug and alcohol abuse. And an alarming number report physical abuse of themselves and their children by their partners. Although the underlying causes of their problems are not readily accessible to direct intervention and remediation, it is possible to expand the numbers and range of services provided to women, mothers and spouses so that counseling and assistance in adjusting to the multiple difficulties they face are more easily available. Language, home economics, food purchase and preparation, recreation and similar programs could go a long way in smoothing the transition and providing valuable coping skills. In addition, more bicultural female case workers, employment counselors, intake workers and health care providers would facilitate contacts with public agencies.

Children and Youth

One sorely needed set of data is that for neonatal and infant mortality. The former is a sensitive indicator of the biological condition of mothers, the state of pre- and post-natal care, and birth conditions themselves. The latter reflects the infant's housing, nutrition, protection from physical risks, and other environmental factors.

Unfortunately, current official figures on infant mortality among Pacific and Asian Americans are badly distorted. For example, Breslow and Klein, using data generated by traditional public health department reports in California, offer a set of numbers which show Japanese and Chinese have lower infant death rates than Anglos or Blacks.[18/] The conclusion drawn from these and similar mortality figures is that Asians, particularly Japanese, have a more favorable community health profile than other groups. This leads to the conclusion that there is less reason for expanding health, nutrition, and other social services in the Asian community(ies). However, the claim for a more favorable mortality profile for Japanese and Chinese is shown to be false when close control is exercised over comparable birth cohorts. Using this tighter methodology, Norris and Shipley demonstrate that Japanese and Chinese do not have a more favorable infant mortality rate.[19/] The apparent discrepancy between the two sets of numbers may be explained by classification errors and births and deaths unreported by the poor and the less assimilated whose deliveries and infant illnesses may not be attended by physicians.

Death Rate per 1,000 Live Births, 0 to 365 Days

	Breslow and Klein	Norris and Shipley
Anglo	18.8	13.3
Black	30.1	32.3
Chinese	15.8	16.1
Japanese	13.2	22.0

Some of the health problems which afflict Pacific and Asian American children and youth may be lessened or eliminated by improving our knowledge about their communities and seeing to it that this information finds its way into the mass media, educational systems, and other informational outlets. Two examples illustrate present shortcomings in information and education. American mass media project and reinforce constantly images of what it takes to be a "successful" person. These images become role models for children -- examples which are reference points for their behavior and attitudes. Media images of physical beauty are almost always Anglo; models of economic success emphasize competition and acquisition of possessions. Yet very few Pacific and Asian youth look like the media-projected role models; and many Pacific and Asian cultures (and families) emphasize collective responsibility and cooperative rather than competitive behavior. Thus on both the physical and behavioral/attitudinal sides, young Pacific and Asian Americans find very few role models which are congruent with their "realities."

In public schools students are taught that certain foods are important and are instructed directly and indirectly in acceptable ways of eating. They are shown pictures of "basic food groups" and are told that they should eat from each in order to promote good health. Rarely do these pictures contain pictures of items from Pacific or Asian traditional diets; and even more rarely is it taught that eating with chopsticks or with one's hands is acceptable. Almost everywhere, knife and fork, ham and egg cultural imperialism is a staple dish in our schools.

The issue of what constitutes good nutrition is particularly salient for Asian and Pacific Americans because there is substantial evidence to show that changes from traditional to American foods is associated with increased frequency of certain health problems. For example, hyperuricemia is not found in the Philippine Islands but is widely reported among Pilipinos in the U.S., giving rise to the hypothesis that Pilipinos have, as a biologically determined characteristic, an inability to handle the higher purine loads imposed by the diet taken in the United States.[20/] Similarly, high rates of cancer of the large bowel and the colon reported for Japanese Americans but rarely found in Japan are thought to be related to the increased consumption of animal fats, dairy products, and certain fruits and vegetables found in the American diet.[21/] Some researchers argue that Asians and most Pacific peoples should avoid consuming dairy products after infancy because they are more intolerant than other groups to lactose since they lack the enzymes necessary to break down successfully the molecular structure of milk.[22/]

The typical Japanese and Pilipino youth, as well as an unknown but probably large percent of their Chinese peers, are fully acculturated and able to interact successfully with the dominant society. This is reflected by their very high levels of educational attainment, complete English fluency and inability to speak their communal language, and their willingness to marry outside the community. They have much more in common with their Anglo peers than their parents a generation ago -- perhaps, even today. Their parents were influenced heavily by the pioneer generation, the grandparents of the present youthful cohort. Consequently, the first American-born generation internalized the values and style of the pioneers, learned the communal

language, but attempted to work in the dominant society. When role models came in conflict, the first American-born generation usually choose their parent's expectations. They worked hard to be successful in school and business, kept their social contacts limited largely to the community, and avoided behavior which would bring sanctions either from Anglos or their parents.

Today's generation of youth are less inhibited and less controlled by traditional forces. Many teenagers fail to see why they should act differently than other teenagers: being Japanese, Pilipino, or Chinese is no reason to accept diffidently abuse and discrimination, or to forego contemporary sexual mores, clothing, hair styles, language and pop culture. Some see no contradiction between seeking to protect their traditional ethnic heritage through confrontation and demonstrations. Although many Pacific and Asian American youth follow traditions and accept the control of community mores and customs, increasing numbers do not.[23/] Entry into the mass culture is reflected in such health problems as unwanted pregnancy, drug abuse, VD, and nervous disorders.[24/] While these problems are not especially prevalent in most Pacific and Asian American communities, merely their presence is a severe shock to many adults. And because there is so little history of juvenile problems of this sort, the communities have been slow to deal with their expression and roots.

Currently, programs which aim to help troubled young people are underway in most large cities. At the same time, efforts to educate the communities to the nature of youth problems and how to deal with their causes should be reinforced

through community organizations, vernacular media and primary and secondary school systems.

Barriers to Health Care

We see from the preceeding that many of the health problems which beset Pacific and Asian American families stem from social, economic and political institutions and processes well beyond family control: while many Pacific and Asian American families enjoy a bountiful life in the United States, there is a significant stratum in each community that lives in want -- indeed, proverty is the bitter reality of many, especially the elderly and the new-comers. Little can be done to resolve these institution-based problems: jobs, housing, transportation, social services, and education will continue to be made available in varying degrees of satisfaction. Curriculae reforms in public schools and authentication of media's portrayal of Pacific and Asian peoples can be accomplished more quickly; but no one knows the extent to which the presentation of accurate information and realistic role models will reduce the stress under which many youth and adults operate.

Aside from these environmental and institutional forces which affect negatively the well-being of families, there are two factors which impinge directly on individual good health: financial barriers to care, and the availability of providers. A number of pilot studies and small-scale surveys have found that the cost of service may be a major determinant of utilization. For example, a 1973/74 survey in southern California found that Japanese and Pilipinos agreed with their low income Anglo and Black neighbors that costs of selected health care services were "too high." (See Table 3.) This view may reflect

Table 3

Percent of Samples Characterizing Selected Health Care Costs as "Too High"

	Anglo	Japanese	Pilipino
Hospital costs	89.4	83.6	81.2
Dentist bills	64.9	65.0	71.0
Physicians fees	68.7	60.0	71.5
Cost of medicine	73.1	65.7	62.9
Total number of cases	208	141	189

source: Jerry L. Weaver, National Health Policy and the Underserved. (C.V. Mosby: St. Louis, 1976), p. 49.

the fact that many Pacific and Asian Americans do not have health and hospital coverage: a 1976 survey found that 39% of Japanese and 63% of Koreans had no insurance protection.[25/] (It is noteworthy that almost all of the Japanese with insurance were covered by group plans from ethnic organizations such as the Japanese American Citizen's League.) A study of Boston's Chinatown found that 80% of the Chinese patients at a neighborhood health center were working poor: "With both parents working, families aren't eligible for medical assistance, but neither their pay nor their benefits allow for comprehensive insurance such as a Blue Cross/Blue Shield master medical plan."[26/] I suspect that a similar fate befalls most recent immigrants.

Although attitudes toward health costs and the absence of health insurance do not mean that Pacific and Asian Americans fail to obtain health care services, it does seem a fair inference to conclude that many individuals forego regular checkups and elective procedures, perhaps even terminate medication or extended therapy, because of pressure on their budgets. Given the high rates of cancer, heart disease and other degenerative illnesses among Pacific and Asian Americans, the absence of easy access to health care implies suffering and early death for hundreds of thousands which might be prevented if financial barriers were reduced or removed.

All people are constrained in obtaining health care by the physical availability of providers. Thus it is an important indicator of community health that more and more providers, especially solo practitioners and specialists, are leaving the inner city or rural regions in favor of suburban comforts

and rewards. Hospitals, clinics, and private offices are often several hours away by bus or inaccessible completely to those without private transportation. The significance of distance in determining utilization is illustrated in a study of the health care behavior of elderly Seattle Pilipinois. Here it was found that those with access to cars obtained services more regularly than those who had to rely on public transportation. Among bus riders, the frequency of utilization declined with increased distance to the facility.[27/]

For many Pacific and Asian Americans, however, distance is less significant in obtaining health care than the ethnicity of those furnishing services because they prefer to deal with bicultural, bilingual professionals. Indeed, southern California Japanese and Pilipinos will drive 30, 40 or more miles to such individuals. Thus for many individuals, "provider" means a fellow Japanese, Chinese, Pilipino, Korean, or IndoChinese.

Steps should be taken to expand the supply of health services available to low income urban residents who form the core of the most-at-risk population. One approach would be to provide subsidized public transportation: individuals could call for door-to-door transportation; alternatively, special discount bus passes could be made available. Another measure which will increase utilization is the expansion of neighborhood clinics staffed with bilingual, bicultural personnel. The pool of community providers can be expanded much more rapidly than many health planners suspect because there exists a sizeable reservoir of currently untapped suppliers in the form of Indians, Koreans, Pilipinos, IndoChinese and other nurses and physicians who have immigrated but are unable to secure licenses.[28/] (See Table 4.) It must

Table 4

Immigation of Health Care Workers

(FY 1967-76)

	Total from all Countries	Total from Asia	Percent of Total Asian
Nurses	59,026	27,762	47.0
Dentists	4,055	2,587	63.8
Pharmacists	7,972	6,148	77.1
Physicians	48,469	29,565	61.0

Source: See Table 1.

not be assumed, however, that Asian and Pacific American providers prefer to work exclusively with communal patients. Just as Anglo providers are free to select specialities and locations, so must non/Anglos be free. Improving the health of underserved populations must be the concern of the entire health industry without regard to gender, color or ethnicity. More reasonable licensure will ease the present injustice suffered by qualified professional while increasing the overall supply of providers - some portion of which may choose community service. In the long term, reduced barriers plus more providers of all backgrounds must be forthcoming. Pacific Islanders face a particularly acute problem in securing health care from community members for within the communities there are very few indigenous health professionals. Opening professional and paraprofessional educational programs is the only means of securing more Guamanian, Samoan, Hawaiian, Tongan, and other Melanesian, Micronesian, and Polynesian providers. Presently, none are found in medicine, psychology, and psychiatry; only recently have a few Guamanians and Samoans entered schools of social work and medicine.[29/] Yet there are 50,000 Samoans and 30,000 Guamanians in California alone; from this pool it should be possible to find likely candidates who could be encouraged to go on to college and post-graduate work.

Currently recruitment efforts and financial support for potential health professionals are entangled in a web of conceptual ambiguity. Critics of special programs or quotas for Pacific and Asian Americans point out that "Asians" are found among medical school classes in greater proportion than their numbers in the national population: indeed, some support for outlawing admissions quotas has come from Asian elements who see fewer seats available for their children if proportional quotas are used. However, a closer look

reveals that "Asian" almost inevitably means Japanese and Chinese. This imbalance suggests the spuriousness of lumping together for reporting purposes all Pacific and Asian communities, and the necessity of scholarship programs and stringent efforts to recruit members of all communities for careers in the health professions and paraprofessions.

Culture and Communalism

Just as there is great cultural diversity among the peoples of the Pacific and Asian basin, there is also great variation in health risks within each community. It would lead to ineffective programs to conclude that all members of a community share the same health care problems. Only in the sense that all individuals run the risk of disease and illness is there uniformity; in fact, as we have seen, both the type of pathology and the probability of illness vary within communities according to gender, age, socioeconomic status, and level of acculturation. Just as not all Chinese live in squalid ghetto rooms, not all Chinese elderly live alone; not all partners in international marriages have severe emotional problems; and not all youth experiment with drugs.

At the aggregate or community level, however, there are probably more poverty-related health problems facing Pilipinos than Japanese since the mean income of the former is less than half that of the latter. Not all Pilipinos live in poverty and not all Japanese are affluent; but health interventions should reflect the different conditions of the various populations. Likewise, we can anticipate relatively more mental health problems over the next few years among the 120,000 IndoChinese refugees than will be found in other more established communities because the IndoChinese must grapple with the aftermath of their abrupt and involuntary relocation and its attendant destruction of careers, families, and social networks.[30/] Comparing the socioeconomic circumstances of the population suggests proportionally more emphasis on counseling and mental health programs for IndoChinese, more nutrition programs and environmental health workers in the Pilipino community, and greater screening for heart disease, hypertension and other stress-related maladies, as well as new attention to nontraditional cite cancers (e.g., of the prostrate or breast) for Japanese.

In treating the health problems of Pacific and Asian communities there is the danger that our emphasis on their cultural particularities will lead to the conclusion that something akin to the "culture of poverty" or the "lower class culture" is the cause of their troubles. As preached in the 1960s, these two approaches, although starting from different theories of why the poor are disadvantaged, came to focus remedial efforts on changing the behavior and attitudes of target populations so they could be fully "assimilated" and, thereby, freed from poverty. Various programs and projects were undertaken in ghettos, barrios and rural slums to bring the disadvantaged into the main stream of American institutions: children were often the target of these efforts, and a variety of approaches was used to bringing them "up" to prevailing cultural and behavioral standards. English-as-a-second-language, head start, trips to museums and other schemes were employed to wipe out those elements of traditional culture, such as diet and language, which were seen as hampering full assimilation.[32/]

To many observers it would seem reasonable to conclude that the best way to overcome many Pacific/Asian American health problems is to speed their acculturation and assimilation into the dominant society. This would make it easier for institutions to deal with individuals: clearly, there are more English-speaking admissions officers, nurses aides, schoolteachers, social workers, and physicians than there are speakers of Japanese, Vietnamese, Mandarin, Lao, or Tagalog. And acculturation would increase "marketable" skills, thus easing entry into the national economy.

This line of reasoning is based on the twin assumptions that the disadvantaged are responsible for their own plight and that the price of a decent living is

learning to speak, think, and behave "like an American." The first perspective absolves the dominant institutions of our society (schools, corporations, unions, public bureaucracies) from responsibility and the necessity for change; the latter flies in the face of the preferences of most ethnic and cultural minorities. The rise during the late 1960s and 70s of ethnic studies programs and the growing pride in traditional institutions and customs we see reflected in renewed interest in classic arts and crafts demonstrate that most community members wish to protect and promote their heritage. Ethnic communities want the language skill and other cognitive tools which will allow their members to compete freely for jobs; but the programs must not require or cause them to abandon their own language, custom and style. In operation, Public Policies should encourage biculturalism and choice. Thus to repeat the programs of the 1960s with their emphasis on speeding assimilation is morally bankrupt and intellectually dishonest because these programs further neither a just society nor reach the heart of the economic and social problems.

Rather than hiring bilingual staff to tell patients where to go and how to behave, personnel should be selected who empathize with their patients and who can teach their colleagues to appreciate the patients' psychological needs and personal lifestyles. This might lead to the realization that day care centers and neighborhood clinics are more "cost-effective" in promoting community health care than multiservice major medical centers since bureaucratic institutions fail to meet the needs of the community.

If health educators see the reliance of Pilipinos, Koreans and others on community contacts for information about health and other services as offering

another means through which to reach people, then they will support ethnic studies programs, language training, and employment of the bicultural. Such an attitude would lead to improved service delivery in the short term because it places a premium on reaching people as they are today. At the same time, language ability, cultural familiarity and physical appearance which separate Pacific and Asian Americans from the dominant society would become valued, not pejorative, traits. This in turn would strengthen the sense of selfworth of those who possess these characteristics and might reduce the extent to which Pacific and Asian individuals suffer psychosomatic diseases, hypertension, mental illness and other stress-induced pathologies.

Strengthening Families

The family structures of Pacific and Asian American communities are undergoing major changes, not because they are Pacific or Asian, but because they are American. We can expect the trends toward more single-parent households, divorce, casual unions, reliance on day care centers and surrogate mothers, and other "nontraditional" forms of living which we see in Anglo society to be encountered increasingly among Pacific and Asian Americans. Such factors as housing design, emphasis on measuring personal worth in terms of one's possessions, occupational and residential mobility, changing sexual mores, and the deterioration of old central-city neighborhoods will continue to affect the styles and forms of all American families.

There is little or nothing public policies can do to reverse or redirect most of these historic trends; government can, however, slow down some of these processes and can ease the impact of others on specific groups. For instance,

the renewal of Los Angeles' Little Tokyo and San Francisco's International Zone have disrupted the environment of many Japanese and Pilipinos, respectively. Elderly and recent immigrants who have the least resources to support them during this violent disruption of their living space have been the most severely hurt by the forced evacuations entailed in these projects. Clearly, the utilitarian principles on which these renewals are based ("the greatest good for the greatest number") worked most severely against many residents of the renewed neighborhoods. Most former residents would agree that for them the projects were not worth the personal costs. If similar renewal schemes are undertaken in other Pacific or Asian neighborhoods, simple justice requires that suitable alternative living arrangements must be provided. It is important to remember that many who live in ethnic enclaves do so because they cannot afford more expensive housing; others because the old neighborhoods offer the cultural amenities such as food shops, theaters, social clubs and associations, restaurants and religious institutions which they need. Short of declaring whole areas "historical places" and prohibiting their destruction, government can do much more than be a passive bystander as residents are pushed out of their homes.

Providing tax incentives, low-cost loans, and other subsidies for the construction of board-and-care homes and convalescent hospitals, combined with a comprehensive, mandatory national health insurance program, could ease much of the financial burden on many Pacific and Asian families and offer real relief to the elderly. So could reforming the social security and tax laws to permit parents to deduct payments to relatives for child care, and elderly recipients to accept such payment without loss of social

security benefits. Strict enforcement of sanitation and industrial safety laws and codes could reduce the environmental hazards faced by many individuals who work in backalley and basement shops, or in agricultural jobs. Incentives should be given landlords to improve their ghetto units, not (as is the case in Harlem and other slums) to let them deteriorate. Meals-on-wheels and community center-based nutrition programs which reflect the preferences of their clients could improve both the physical and mental health of many poor or isolated elderly by enriching their diets while offering recreational and social activities.

If, as I have argued, some of the health problems of Pacific and Asian peoples rest in the psychological burdens which result from dealing with but not being accepted by the dominant society, programs which reinforce positive images and offer authentic role models for Pacific and Asian peoples can help many individuals reduce stress by externally reinforcing their sense of self-worth. More vigorous enforcement of affirmative action hiring in the mass media, combined with grant programs to support the development and presentation of historical, cultural, fine arts, and other projects, will have a long term beneficial result in reaffirming one's identity while helping to correct old stereotypes and ignorance.

In the short term, expanded efforts in health education are in order so that Pacific and Asian peoples, as well as the medical profession, can become aware of changing morbidity patterns. Presently, many physicians who treat Asian women give little attention to screening for breast cancer or to teaching their patients self-examination because medical textbooks report

breast cancer as practically unknown among Asians. Current research, however, reveals that the frequency of malignant neoplasms in second and third generation Asian-Americans is growing alarmingly and is approaching the Anglo rate.

Research on the association between diet and disease should be supported generously since there is ample evidence that among Pacific and Asian peoples there is an increased frequency of several health problems as consumption of certain foods increases.

More bicultural facilities and personnel are needed; but great care must be exercised in determining the needs of particular communities. To gain a clearer picture of health problems and needs, federal authorities should require that data being reported for "Asians" be disaggregated and reported by specific community.

Licensure requirements should be reformed to make access to practice easier for those who have established credentials and relevant experience. Presently, apparently well-qualified health professionals must return to school for one or more years of training before taking state boards. Lacking scholarships and personal savings, many immigrants are unable to meet this pre-requisite.

More providers can be graduated if financial support is available from colleges and universities. For instance, Pacific and Asian students might agree to practice family medicine or provide equivalent services for a

fixed minimum period of time in underserved areas in return for financial support during their education and training.

* * *

None of these proposals will guarantee the preservation and promotion of particular forms or styles of family life; indeed, it is not the business of government to attempt to do so. Families change and evolve along with the social and economic institutions and processes with which they interact. Yet evolution need not breed uniformity; in a free society choice of family organization must be left to the judgment and preferences of its members. There is no place in a democracy for a dictatorial majority which attempts to impress its idea of the public interest and good life on others. Rather, government, acting through the allocation of its resources, should sustain the greatest possible range of diversity. Nowhere is this more critical than in dealing with the Pacific/Asian communities in which family relations and organization are found in great variety.

Promoting the good health of Pacific and Asian communities calls for sensitivity to cultural and communal differences, requires the generation of new information, and demands recognition of the rapidly changing nature of many populations. These goals will be gained only by working closely with and being guided by community groups and spokespersons. In this way the promise of social justice and human dignity which has drawn so many Pacific and Asian peoples to America can be fulfilled.

1. Jerry L. Weaver, National Health Policy and the Underserved: Ethnic Minorities, Women, and the Elderly (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1976), pp. 43-44.

2. Sharon Fujii, "Older Asian Americans: Victims of Multiple Jeopardy," Civil Rights Digest, 9 (Fall 1976), p. 25.

3. Unless Otherwise noted, migration figures are based on data supplied by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Feb. 1978.

4. Fujii, "Older Asian Americans", p. 25.

5. Haitung King, "Selected Epidemiologic Aspects of Major Diseases and Causes of Death among Chinese in the United States and Asia," in Arthur Kleinman, et al. (ed.), Medicine in Chinese Cultures: Comparative Studies of Health Care in Chinese and Other Societies (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1976), p. 525.

6. Timothy R. Brown, et al., "Mental Illness and the Role of Mental Facilities in Chinatown," in Stanley Sue and Nathaniel N. Wagner (eds.), Asian American Psychological Perspectives (Ben Lomond, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1973), pp. . See also Stanley Sue and Herman McKinney, "Asian Americans in the Community Mental Health Care System," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45:1 (Jan. 75), pp ; Ben R. Tong, "The Ghetto of the Mind: Notes on the Historical Psychology of Chinese America," Amerasia Jr. 1:3 (1971), pp. 1-31; Susan Chang, "Mental Health in Chinatown," Bridge 1 (1974), pp. 34-37; Stanley Sue and Derold Sue, "Chinese-American Personality and Mental Health," Amerasia Jr. 1:2 (1971), pp. 36-49.

7. Albert C. Gaw, "An Integrated Approach in the Delivery of Health Care to a Chinese Community in America: The Boston Experience," in Kleinman, et al., Medicine in Chinese Cultures, p. 332.

8. Issei Survey, Los Angeles' "Little Tokyo," (Summer 1968), available from the Japanese American Studies Center, UCLA.

9. Harry Kitano and Tom Owan, Japanese and Korean Responses to Health Needs in Los Angeles. (1977), Mineo.

10. Royal F. Morales, Makibaka: The Pilipino America Struggle (Los Angeles: Mountainview Publishers, 1974).

11. Jerry L. Weaver and James Allan Constantino, "Health Care Problems of the Elderly," in Jesse Quinsaat (ed.), Letters in Exile: An Introductory Reader on the History of Pilipinos in America (Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center, UCLA, 1976), pp. 122-130.

12. Richard A. Kalish and Sharon Moriwaki, "The World of the Elderly Asian American," Journal of Social Issues 29 (1973), pp. 187-193; Arthur K. Ito, Institutionalization - Ethnic Elders Need More Than Medical Care (paper presented to the Institute on Minority Aging, California State University, San Diego, June 1974); Richard A. Kalish and Sam Yuen, "Americans of East Asian Ancestory: Aging and the Aged," Gerontologist 2 (Spring 1971), pp. 36-47; Jerry L. Weaver, "Personal Health Care: A Major Concern for Minority Aged," in E. Percil Stanford (ed.), Comprehensive Service Delivery Systems for the Minority Aged (Center on Aging, San Diego State University, 1977), pp. 41-62.

13. Stanford M. Lyman, "Generation and Character: The Case of the Japanese American," in Hilory Conroy and T. Scott Miyakawa (eds.), East Across the Pacific: Historical and Sociological Studies of Japanese Immigration and Assimilation (Santa Barbara: Clio Press, 1972), pp. 279-314. See also John Lamont and Carol Tyler, "Racial Differences in Rate of Depression," Journal of Clinical Psychology 29 (October 1973), pp. 428-432; Mamory Iga, "The Japanese Social Structure and the Source of Mental Stress in Japanese Immigrants in the United States, "Social Forces" 35 (March 1957), pp. 271-278; Harry H. Kitano, "Mental Illness in Four Cultures," Journal of Social Psychology 80 (1970), pp. 121-134; Harry H. Kitano, Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969).

14. Ron Chernow, "Chinatown, Their Chinatown: The Truth Behind the Facade," New York, 11 June 1973, 39-45.

15. Chen-Ya Huang and Freda Grachow, The Dilemma of Health Services in Chinatown, New York City (Paper presented at the 1976 meeting of the American Public Health Association).

16. Frederick P. Li, et al., "Health Care for the Chinese Community in Boston," American Journal of Public Health 62 (April 1972), pp. 536-539; Stuart H. Cattell, Health, Welfare and Social Organization in Chinatown, New York City (New York: Community Service Society of New York City, 1962); "Chinatown USA, 1970," California's Health, February 1970, 1-3; Francis H. Chang and Stephen Tang, "A Neighborhood Health Center: One Community's Solution," Civil Rights Digest, 10:1 (Fall 1977), pp. 19-23; Gaw, "An Integrated Approach."

    For an historical account of health and health care services in a 19th century community, see Joan B. Trauner, "The Chinese as Medical Scapegoats in San Francisco," Chinese Historical Society of America Bulletin 9:4 (April 1974).

17. Fred Cordova, "The Filipino-American: There's Always an Identity Crisis," in Sue and Wagner, Asian American Perspectives, pp. 136-319; Donald F. Duff and Ransom J. Arthur, "Between Two Worlds: Filipinos in the U.S. Navy," American Journal of Psychiatry 123 (January 1967), pp. 836-843;

H. Elton Hooper, "A Filipino in California Copes With Anxiety," in Georgene H. Seward (ed.), Clinical Studies in Cultural Conflict (New York: Ronald Press, 1958), pp. 265-290.

18. Lester Breslow and Bonnie Klein, "Health and Race in California," American Journal of Public Health 61 (April 1971), pp. 763-775.

19. Frank Norris and Paul W. Shippley, "A Closer Look at Race Differentials in California' Infant Mortality, 1965-67," HSMHA Health Reports 86 (September 1971), pp. 810-814.

20. Louis A. Healey, Jr., et al., "Hyperuricemia in Filipinos: Interaction of Heredity and Environment," American Journal of Human Genetics 19 (March 1967), pp. 81-85.

21. John E. Dunn, Jr., "Cancer Epidemiology in Populations of the United States - With Emphasis on Hawaii and California - and Japan," Cancer Research 35 (November 1975), pp. 3240-3245. See also M. G. Marmot and and S. L. Syme, "Acculturation and Coronary Heart Disease in Japanese Americans," American Journal of Epidemiology 104 (1976), pp. 225-247.

22. Myung H. Chung and Douglas B. McGill, "Lactase Deficiency in Orientals," Gastroenterology 54 (February 1968), pp. 225-231; Minal A. Nandi and Ellen S. Parham, "Milk Drinking by the Lactose Intolerant," American Dietetic Association Journal 61 (September 1972), pp. 258-261.

23. See the discussion of changing behavior and attitudes presented in Stanford M. Lyman, "Japanese-American Generation Gap," Society 10:2 (January/February 1973), pp. 55-63.

24. Derald Sue and Frank Austin, "A Typological Approach to the Psychological Study of Chinese and Japanese College Males," Journal of Social Issues 29 (1973), pp. 129-148; Gary M. Matsumoto, General M. Meredith, and Minoru Masuda, "Ethnic Identity: Honolulu and Seattle Japanese-Americans," in Sue and Wagner, Asian-American Perspectives, pp. 65-74; Irene Fujitomi and Diane Wong, "The New Asian-American Woman," ibid, pp. 252-263; Bok-lim C. Kim, "Asian-Americans: No Model Minority," Social Work 18 (May 1973), pp. 44-53; Yukio Okano and Bernard Spika, "Ethnic Identity, Alienation, and Achievement in Japanese-American Families," Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 2 (September 1971), pp. 273-282; Proceedings of the First National Conference on Asian American Mental Health, 27-29 April 1972, San Francisco; Richard A. Kalish, "Suicides: An Ethnic Comparison," Journal of Suicidology, July 1967, pp.

25. Kitano and Owan, Japanese and Korean Responses.

26. Chang and Tang, "Neighborhood Health Center," p. 23.

27. "Health Assessment of Elderly in International District, Seattle, Washington," (Seattle: Demonstration Project for Asian Americans, 1972), pp. 21-22.

28. California Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, "A Dream Unfulfilled: Korean and Pilipino Health Professionals in California," May 1975.

29. Faye U. Muñoz, "A Struggle Against Anonymity: Pacific Islanders in the U.S.," Civil Rights Digest 9:1 (Fall 1976), pp. 42-43.

30. Tran Tuong Nhu, "The Trauma of Exile: Viet-Nam Refugees," ibid, pp. 59-62.

31. Jerry L. Weaver, "Government Doctrine as a Component of Political Power," in Frank L. Baird (ed.), Mexican Americans: Political Power, Influence, or Resource (Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech Press, 1977), pp. 33-48.

EDUCATION AND THE ASIAN-AMERICAN FAMILY

by

Bob H. Suzuki
Associate Professor
School of Education
University of Massachusetts/Amherst

Prepared for the
Conference on Pacific and Asian American Families
and HEW-related Issues
Airlie, Virginia, March 9-12, 1978

Sponsored by

Division of Asian American Affairs/Office of Special Concerns
Office of the Secretary of the Department of HEW

NOT TO BE REPRODUCED IN WHOLE OR PART WITHOUT PERMISSION OF AUTHOR.

B-159

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade, there has been increasing attention paid to the influence of the family on the outcomes of schooling. Most of the numerous studies on this subject have focused on cognitive outcomes and on comparing Black families against white families (e.g., Coleman, 1966; Jencks, 1972). Far fewer studies have focused on noncognitive outcomes and the impact of the schools on the family (Leichter, 1974; Wynne, 1976); and even fewer have focused on these family/school interactions for the case of Asian Americans.

My intent in the present paper is to examine the contemporary educational problems of Asian Americans from a perspective that emphasizes the socialization function of schools and its resulting impact on the family. Consequently, many aspects of the less-studied issues mentioned above will necessarily arise in the course of this examination. It is hoped that such an approach will not only yield some useful insights into the causes of many of the problems being faced by Asian Americans, but also contribute to our general understanding of how the schools interact with the family through their influence on noncognitive development.

Of course, to even suggest that serious problems in education exist for Asian Americans may seem to border on the absurd to many people. Asian-American students are almost universally viewed as industrious, conscientious and well-behaved high achievers, and their educational attainments have been widely acclaimed (Peterson, 1966; Alsop, 1971). Unfortunately, such a view is superficial at best and has contributed to widespread misconceptions that have impeded efforts to identify and meet the educational needs of Asian Americans.

The development of a less superficial and more realistic picture of the actual state of affairs requires us to address a number of questions, some of rather broad scope. What is the role of schools in American society and their impact on the family? What are some of the unique characteristics of the Asian-American family and how did they evolve? How do the socialization patterns in Asian-American families differ from those in the schools? What has been the impact of these differences in socialization patterns and other family/school discontinuities on the Asian-American child and family? What are some of the major problems and issues currently facing Asian-American families in the field of education? The primary purpose of this paper is to attempt to answer these questions and to present a number of policy recommendations for guiding legislative action in the area of education based on our analysis of the Asian-American family.

In order to achieve this purpose, the paper is organized into four major sections. These will cover, successively, the following topics: (1) a revised view of schooling in American society based on recent reinterpretations and analyses, (2) the characteristics of the Asian-American family, (3) the impact of the schools on the Asian-American family, and (4) a summary of the paper together with a list of the policy recommendations.

Since it will not be possible to present a comprehensive picture of all Asian-American families within the scope of this paper, only the families of the two largest Asian-American ethnic groups, the Chinese and Japanese, will be treated. The term, Asian American, will be used to refer to only these two groups, and not to other groups, such as the Koreans, Pilipinos, East Indians and Indochinese, that are usually included in the generic use of the term.[1]

[1]However, I suspect that many of the generalizations developed in this paper will have some validity for the families of all these groups, especially those of the Koreans and Pilipinos.

It also excludes such groups as Samoans, Guamanians and Hawaiians, that are usually referred to as Pacific Islanders.

Furthermore, given the wide range of variations that exist between and within even Chinese and Japanese families, our approach will be that of modal description and analysis. These families will be assumed to have enough characteristics in common that they may be generally described and analyzed as a single social entity. The obvious problem with this approach is that it tends to lead to broad generalizations at the expense of important particularistic aspects. It also poses the very real danger that such generalizations may be misused to stereotype all Asian Americans. To partly counter these inclinations, differences between and within Chinese and Japanese families will be described whenever such distinctions appear important enough to point out.

Despite the inherent shortcomings of the modal approach, it does have the decided advantage of enabling us to analyze family/school interactions in fairly concrete terms without unnecessarily complicating and confusing the analysis. Moreover, if finer distinctions are desired, the analytical framework developed in this paper should be applicable, albeit with considerable additional effort, to the various sub-categories among Chinese and Japanese families, as well as to the many other Pacific Island and Asian-American ethnic groups.

TOWARD A REVISED VIEW OF SCHOOLING IN AMERICAN SOCIETY[2]

In recent years, partly as a result of the upheavals in urban schools during the turbulent decades of the sixties, a group of revisionist historians have strongly challenged the conventional interpretation of American educational history. This conventional history--labeled the "Great School Legend" by Colin Greer (1972)--has generally portrayed the public school system as the institution primarily responsible for the democratization of American society. It saw the schools not only educating the masses to produce an informed, enlightened electorate, but also serving as the "great equalizer" by giving all children, no matter how humble their backgrounds, an equal chance to succeed and realize the American dream (Cubberley, 1919; Bailyn, 1960; Cremin, 1965). Historians of this bent tended to view Blacks and other minorities as simply the last of the various ethnic groups to migrate to the urban centers. According to this "immigrant analogy," once these minorities were assimilated to white, middle-class norms, they would eventually follow the same path toward upward mobility taken by the white ethnic groups that had preceded them (Handlin, 1966; Dowie, 1964).

However, the revisionists could not reconcile this optimistic version of history with the crisis facing urban inner-city schools. This interpretation could not explain for them why the schools had failed so disastrously for minority children unless they accepted both the racist assumptions of the "deficit hypothesis" (Valentine, 1968; Cole and Bruner, 1971; Kamins, 1974) and the improbability of an almost overnight deterioration in school conditions. These apparent contradictions led the revisionists to undertake studies which have resulted in a very different interpretation of American educational history

[2]This is a condensed version of a more extensive summary of the revisionist interpretation contained in an earlier paper (Suzuki, 1977).

(Katz, 1971; Spring, 1972; Greer, 1972; Carnoy, 1972; Karier, et al., 1973). Only a cursory outline of this revisionist interpretation will be presented here.

The revisionists basically argue, contrary to the conventional interpretation, that the American educational system has largely served to maintain the unequal, hierarchical class structure of American society by sorting out and differentially socializing students from different socioeconomic backgrounds for their appropriate positions in that structure. At the same time, they contend, the system also has served to legitimize this structure by creating the illusion of providing equal opportunity to everyone for upward mobility.

To provide support for this thesis, the revisionists have reexamined the historical development of public education in the United States from its early beginnings in the small rural and village schools of the early 1800's to the much larger, consolidated urban school systems that were already universal, free (i.e., tax-supported) and compulsory by the early 1900's. Based on their reexamination, they argue that this transformation did not happen fortuitously, but was systematically promoted by powerful business interests over other decentralized, locally-controlled alternatives. This was done, they contend, in order to centralize control of the schools so that they could be utilized to inculcate the children of the "unruly" working class with the proper values and habits to make them into docile, productive and cooperative workers.

Not surprisingly, the revisionist interpretation has elicited strong counterattacks from many quarters. The revisionists have been criticized for being overly presentist, distorting the facts to fit their thesis, overlooking contrary evidence, and oversimplifying interpretations of complex historical events, not to mention a host of other sins of commission and omission (Lazerson, 1973; Butts, 1974; Eisele, 1975; Urban, 1975; Hammack, 1976). They have also been criticized for "writing a gloomy version of relatively conflict-free consensus history," by portraying the masses as the helpless victims of elite domination,

rather than as a contentious force that has always had to be reckoned with in the educational arena (Featherstone, 1977). Notwithstanding, even their critics give the revisionists due credit for rejuvenating interest in a field that was becoming stale, if not moribund, and for introducing a much-needed alternative perspective.

The new insights emanating from this perspective are well exemplified in a recently-published work by Bowles and Gintis (1976). Their economic and sociological analysis on what must certainly be one of the most cherished beliefs in the educational system--that of the "meritocratic thesis, the educational system functions in such a way that those with innate intellectual abilities in our society are generally able to advance regardless of their socioeconomic backgrounds. More specifically, the thesis posits that the schools: (1) sort out (by means of IQ tests) those children with innate intellectual abilities, (2) send them on to additional years of schooling, (3) help them attain superior cognitive skills, and finally, (4) enable them to acquire higher paying jobs. The thesis has received strong support from studies conducted by educational economists who have shown that both the income and IQ of an individual are highly correlated with the number of years of schooling he has acquired (Becker, 1964; Schultz, 1963).

In challenging the meritocratic thesis, Bowles and Gintis carried out a rather ingenious analysis on a large body of data on the socioeconomic characteristics of white males in the United States. They were able to show rather convincingly that, on the average, a person's income depends primarily on his educational level (years of schooling) and family socioeconomic background (SEB), and does not depend to any significant degree on either his level of cognitive skills (as measured by standard achievement tests) or childhood IQ. This result clearly invalidates the meritocratic thesis since it shows that the income of

higher-paid individuals cannot be explained by their attainment of superior cognitive skills or by their higher "innate intelligence." However, at this point, one may well ask: Why doesn't income depend on cognitive skills? And, moreover, if the dependency of income on education is not related to cognitive skills, just how does schooling influence a person's earning power?

Bowles and Gintis answer the first question by basically arguing that while cognitive skills are important for most jobs, they are not scarce since they are usually produced in sufficient abundance through schooling and/or on the job and, therefore, are not important determinants of a person's income. Consequently, they contend, other criteria including race, sex, personality and credentials become the primary determinants of whether a person is hired or promoted.

They answer the second question by arguing that certain noncognitive traits, such as personality (e.g., motivation, perseverance, docility), modes of self-presentation (e.g., manner of speech and dress) and class loyalties, are differentiated among people according to their position in the class structure and tend to be reproduced from generation to generation through the socialization process that begins in the family.

> Thus, children of parents occupying a given position in the occupational hierarchy grow up in homes where child-rearing methods and perhaps even the physical surroundings tend to develop personality characteristics appropriate to adequate job performance in the occupational roles of the parents. The children of managers and professionals are taught self-reliance within a broad set of constraints; the children of production-line workers are taught conformity and obedience (Bowles, 1972:48).

These patterns, they further argue, are strongly reinforced by the schools through the structural correspondence that exists between the social relations of schools and those of production. This is most evident in the hierarchical structure of most schools in which there are vertical lines of authority from administrators to teachers to students, and in which students, like production workers, become alienated since they have little control over their education.

This correspondence principle is further reflected in the social relations exhibited at different levels of schooling.

> ... in education, lower levels (junior and senior high school) tend to severely limit and channel the activities of students. Somewhat higher up the educational ladder, teacher and community colleges allow for more independent activity and less overall supervision. At the top, the elite four-year colleges emphasize social relationships conformable with the higher levels in the production hierarchy (Bowles and Gintis, 1976:132).

Finally, the unequal financing of the schools results in similar differences between the social relations of working-class schools and those of schools in upper-income communities. Poorly financed schools in working-class communities must usually contend with overcrowded classrooms, deteriorating facilities and inadequate material and human resources, which force administrators and teachers to adopt rigid, authoritarian procedures and practices that tend to mirror those of the factory. On the other hand, well-financed schools can afford to hire more teachers and specialists, build facilities with open, flexible environments, and acquire the latest in innovative equipment and materials; thereby, enabling administrators and teachers to individualize instruction and develop independence, self-initiative and other characteristics in children to prepare them for adequate job performance in the upper levels of the occupational hierarchy.

According to Bowles and Gintis, these aspects of schooling contribute to the reproduction of the unequal class structure of American society by reinforcing and inculcating noncognitive traits in students that are characteristic of their family SEB. The exceptional few who manage to move upward in the occupational hierarchy through their educational attainments gain this mobility not because of their increased cognitive skills, but primarily because their socialization through schooling has made them acceptable to employers for higher job status. At the same time, this limited mobility lends credence to the meritocratic thesis and, thereby, serves to legitimate social inequality.

Approaches similar to that of Bowles and Gintis have also been recently developed by a number of other sociologists of education including Pierre Bourdieu in France, Basil Bernstein in England and Randall Collins in the United States. All of them are concerned with how social structure shapes educational phenomena (e.g., curriculum, pedagogy, teacher/student relations, testing) and how these, in turn, reproduce social inequality. Bourdieu (1973; 1977) has focused on how class-based cultural differences, operating through curriculum and pedagogy, reproduce and legitimate social inequality; while Bernstein (1971; 1975) has been more interested in how class differences in language style affect educational phenomena and outcomes. Collins (1977) draws on Bourdieu's concept of a cultural marketplace to analyze why different educational systems have developed in different types of societies. While there are important differences between these theorists, their basic approach, together with the historical perspective provided by the revisionists, will be applied when we later analyze the impact of the schools on the Asian-American family.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ASIAN-AMERICAN FAMILY

In order to be able to analyze how the schools impact on the Asian-American family, we must first have some knowledge of its general characteristics. Therefore, in this section, we shall try to provide a modal description of the contemporary Asian-American family, focusing most of our attention on families of second and third generation. To provide some perspective on how the Asian-American family evolved, we shall begin by briefly surveying the socio-historical changes it has undergone since the arrival of the first Asian immigrants. We shall then describe the contemporary Asian-American family's cultural values, structure and relationships, child-rearing practices, and kinship and community relationships. Finally, we shall discuss some of the major problems and issues currently confronting the families of recent Chinese immigrants.

The description and analysis to be presented were based on a variety of studies and sources. Among these were major works on Chinese Americans by Lee (1960), Kung (1962), Sung (1967), Hsu (1971), Nee and Nee (1972) and Lyman (1974); and major works on Japanese Americans by Ichihashi (1932), Broom and Kitsuse (1956), Kitano (1969), Peterson (1971) and Kiefer (1974). Also utilized were works focusing on Asian Americans in Hawaii by Fuchs (1961), Johnson (1972) and Ogawa (1973). All of these authors either specifically focused on or gave considerable attention to the family. Finally, numerous articles, papers and reports were utilized and will be cited as appropriate. While much remains to be learned, the available information does allow us to draw a reasonably discernible, though very general, picture of the contemporary Asian-American family.[3]

---

[3]No attempt will be made here to describe the traditional families of China and Japan. However, interested readers may consult works by Lang (1946), Hsu (1949), Yang (1959) and Freedman (1970) on the Chinese family, and works by Embree (1939), Benedict (1946), Beardsley, et al. (1959) and Befu (1971) on the Japanese family.

Socio-historical Changes

Since the Chinese and Japanese faced different circumstances at different times in history, the socio-historical changes undergone by their families will be described separately for each group.

Chinese-American families. Due to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the resulting shortage of women, families were practically nonexistent among the early Chinese immigrants. The few Chinese wives present were married to the wealthier merchants. Although many of the immigrants had left families behind in China, most of them, together with their unmarried compatriots, were destined to live out their lives as homeless bachelors (Lyman, 1974).

It was not until the 1920's that the bachelor-society character of the Chinatowns began to change as families became increasingly visible (Nee and Nee, 1972). Many of these families were started by former laborers who achieved merchant status and were finally eligible to bring wives over from China. Others were started by marriages between immigrants and the few American-born Chinese women. Because wives were prized, they had more status than their counterparts in China and, indeed, sometimes assumed more authority than their husbands. Since grandparents were usually absent, they also did not have to contend with the dictates of mother-in-laws. Moreover, the traditional extended, patrifocal family was generally replaced by the nuclear family (Sung, 1967).

Many of the children in these early families grew up in the familiar surroundings of their parents' small shop, laundry or restaurant, where they lived and helped in the family business. While most of them were subjected to strict, traditional upbringing, their early childhood was generally secure and family-centered. However, when they began school and were exposed to Western ideas and values, cultural conflicts with parents frequently broke out and led to strained relations (Lowe, 1943; Wong, 1950). Parents were inevitably forced to make some concessions to this Americanization process, but still managed to

inculcate their children with many traditional values and norms.

The number of Chinese families increased markedly in the aftermath of World War II as a result of special legislation which allowed thousands of Chinese women to immigrate into the United States (Kung, 1962). Husbands were reunited with their wives after decades of separation, and thousands of immigrants went to Hong Kong to bring back wives, usually much younger than themselves. Such circumstances led to adjustment problems and familial patterns similar to those of the earlier immigrant families.

The post-war era was also the period when second-generation Chinese-American families--i.e., those in which both parents were American-born--began to emerge. The parents of these families were better educated and generally had higher status jobs than the parents of first-generation families. Although they still faced widespread discrimination, many of them sought to escape the confines of the Chinatowns and managed to break into and find better housing in a few of the predominantly-white suburbs (Lee, 1960). As a consequence, however, their families were subjected to more intense acculturation pressures. These pressures have produced familial patterns among second- and third-generation families that depart in a number of significant ways from traditional patterns.

More recently, during the past decade, there has been an increasing influx of Chinese immigrants into the United States. These recent immigrants now comprise over one-third of the total Chinese-American population. Their families must contend with societal forces quite different from those encountered by the earlier immigrant families. Consequently, they also face different problems and are undergoing different changes.

Japanese-American families. The early Japanese immigrants were more fortunate than their Chinese predecessors in that most of them were able to bring wives from Japan before the cutoff of immigration. Consequently, they were able to begin family life in the United States within a decade or two after

their arrival. Since the majority were engaged in farming, they tended to continue many of the traditional ways of rural family life in Japan.

There were, however, a few significant departures from these traditional ways. As in the case of the early Chinese immigrant families, wives generally had more say in family matters than their counterparts in Japan, and the extended family was replaced by the nuclear type due to the absence of grandparents. Parental authority tended to diminish as the Nisei became Americanized through the schools and occasionally rebelled against traditional mores, such as filial piety (Masuoka, 1944; Iga, 1957).

The childhoods of most Nisei were spent under the close, protective care and supervision of their parents either on the family's farm or in its place of business. In farming families, mothers often took their infant children out into the fields and cared for them as they worked. As the Nisei grew older, they were expected to help their parents on the farm or in the family business. Thus, except while they were in school, they were almost always in close contact with their parents. Even out in the Japanese community, they could not escape scrutiny by relatives and family acquaintances.

Perhaps no event had a greater impact on Japanese-American families than the internment experience of World War II (Broom and Kitsuse, 1956; Thomas and Nishimoto, 1946). The sudden uprooting of families and the oppressive conditions in the concentration camps had traumatic, long-lasting effects on the family, which even today have not been fully assessed (Morishima, 1973).

Many Japanese Americans, especially the Nisei, felt deeply stigmatized by their internment experience. After their release from the camps, many of them undoubtedly decided, consciously or unconsciously, to reject all vestiges of Japanese culture and to acculturate as quickly as possible into the American mainstream (Okimoto, 1971). This attitude appears to have had a strong influence on the subsequent development of familial patterns among the Nisei and Sansei

on the mainland (Kiefer, 1974).

Since the Japanese in Hawaii were not mass-incarcerated during the war and constituted a numerical majority, they were subjected to less intense acculturation pressures and appear to have maintained more of the traditional familial patterns than their mainland counterparts.

Although Japanese immigration into the United States has also increased during the past decade, it has been of much smaller magnitude than Chinese immigration. Presently, recent Japanese immigrants comprise only a small percentage of the total Japanese-American population.

Current categories of families. The evolutionary process described above has led to a wide variety of Asian-American families. These could be grouped into an almost unlimited number of categories. However, since we are using a modal approach, we will assume that most of the families can be grouped into two broad categories: (1) families headed by American-born Chinese and Japanese of second or third generation, and (2) families headed by recent Chinese immigrants. No attempt will be made to describe other smaller categories of families, such as those of recent Japanese immigrants, Asian scholars and intellectuals, or interracial marriages. It should also be noted that families headed by early Chinese or Japanese immigrants are practically nonexistent today.

In the next four subsections, discussion will focus primarily on the first category of families. For the most part, consistent with our modal approach, this category will be treated as a single social entity. Inasmuch as the high influx of Chinese immigrants is a relatively recent phenomenom, very little detailed information on the characteristics of the second category of families is presently available. Consequently, we shall only provide a somewhat cursory description of their circumstances in the final subsection.

Cultural Values

The early Asian immigrants, like other immigrant groups, brought with them cultural values deeply rooted in their countries of origin. Many of these traditional values appear to have been modified, often significantly, through the process of acculturation. Generally speaking, third-generation Asian Americans have acculturated to a greater degree than second-generation Asian Americans, with Japanese showing greater acculturation than their Chinese counterparts (Sue and Kirk, 1973). Certain values, such as filial piety and respect for the wisdom of the elderly, appear to have depreciated more than others. Parents can no longer expect unquestioning obedience from their children, and relationships within the family have become more democratic. Furthermore, the knowledge and experience of grandparents no longer carry the weight they did in the past.

Despite such acculturative trends, both generations of Asian Americans are still found to subscribe to many traditional values, though to a lesser degree than first-generation Asian Americans. In particular, they appear to believe more strongly than their Anglo counterparts in such values as respect for ethical behavior, duty and obligation to family, restraint of strong feelings, respect for authority, and modesty and politeness toward others (Kitano, 1969; Schwartz, 1971; Fong, 1973; Sue, 1973).

However, Asian Americans appear to be experiencing considerable psychological stress in attempting to maintain these values. They have been found to be more conforming, obedient, conservative and inhibited than their Anglo peers. These personality traits appear to be the result not only of traditional cultural values, but also of discrimination (Tong, 1971; Watanabe, 1973). Moreover, many of them are apparently suffering acute anxieties and conflicts as manifested by excessive conformity, lack of confidence, and feelings of self-contempt and alienation (Yamamoto, 1968; Sue and Sue, 1971; Sue and Frank, 1973).

Family Structure and Relationships

It has become almost axiomatic to describe the Asian-American family as patriarchical; i.e., as vertically structured, with the father as undisputed head and all others in subordinate roles. While this traditional structure may have prevailed in many first-generation families, it has almost certainly been modified in second-and third-generation families. In fact, as mentioned earlier, even in first-generation families, the mother frequently assumed much more authority than her counterpart in Asia.

In second-and third-generation Asian-American families, husbands and wives appear to play complementary roles. One study (Johnson, 1972) of Nisei and Sansei families found that most husbands and wives made major decisions jointly and that their relationships were more often cooperative than disjunctive. Moreover, the investigator found that in such family matters as finances, social activities and child rearing, the wives were usually the decision-makers. Although more research is needed, these findings seem consistent with the impressions of many Asian Americans themselves and are probably generalizeable to a large proportion of contemporary Asian-American families.

Paradoxically, despite such findings, the Asian-American male is generally seen as more chauvinistic than his Anglo counterpart (Fujitomi and Wong, 1973). Even in the study described above, most of the wives saw their husbands in the dominant position. The persistence of such views may be partly due to the strong mutual dependency that develops between Asian-American husbands and wives as a result of early socialization patterns (Caudill, 1952). One aspect of this relationship is the tendency for the husband to depend heavily on his wife to provide moral and ego support through responses that may appear indulgent and subservient by middle-class Anglo standards, even though their relationship may be more egalitarian in terms of actual power distribution.

Relationships between Asian-American parents and their children have also

become more egalitarian. While they are still differentially socialized, boys enjoy little, if any, preferential treatment or status over girls with regard to the allocation of family resources. Furthermore, the duties and obligations expected of children are less demanding and restrictive than in the past. However, they are still generally subjected to stricter limits and constraints than their Anglo peers (Kriger and Kroes, 1972).

Verbal communication within Asian-American families is relatively restrained compared to that in Anglo families. This verbal reticence is not only rooted in traditional cultural norms, but may have been also strongly reinforced by racial discrimination (Watanabe, 1973). On the other hand, there appears to be much greater utilization of non-verbal and indirect modes of communication. Family members generally become quite sensitive to reading non-verbal cues and between the lines of indirect statements.

Unlike traditional Asian families, contemporary Asian-American families are not dominated by parent-son relationships. The strongest relationships appear to be those between husband and wife and between the mother and her children. Husbands and wives appear to enjoy much closer companionship today than in earlier families. Since mothers continue to assume most of the responsibility for child rearing, they develop the closest relationships with their children. Fathers still tend to maintain some distance from their children to engender respect and obedience. While fathers play with their children, they do not try to become close companions to the extent that Anglo fathers do. Parents are more likely to show affection to their children in indirect ways (e.g. by sacrificing their own needs for their children's), rather than by words or overt displays of affection, such as hugging or kissing.

These relationships have served to make the Asian-American family a close-knit social unit. This cohesiveness is reflected in the social activities of Asian-American families, which tend to be more family-centered than those of

Anglo families. Children are more likely to be included in Asian-American social gatherings since parents appear less comfortable about leaving them at home with babysitters (Hsu, 1971; Kitano, 1969).

Child Rearing

While acculturation toward Anglo middle-class patterns has taken place, many aspects of traditional Asian child-rearing practices appear to be continued among contemporary Asian-American families (Young, 1972; Sollenberger, 1968; Johnson, 1972; Kitano, 1969). The early years of childhood are still characterized by close, nurturant care by the mother, who tends to be more permissive with the young infant than her Anglo counterpart. Infants are seldom allowed to cry for prolonged periods before they are picked up by their mothers. Mothers tend to feed their infants on demand rather than by scheduling. On the average, weaning takes place at a later age than for Anglo infants. Toilet training is also more gradual. Parents often allow the young child to sleep with them, occasionally tolerating such behavior even after the child begins school.

Such indulgences would very likely be viewed by middle-class Anglo parents as a sure way of spoiling the child and retarding his/her development into a mature, independent and autonomous adult. However, such an approach to child rearing develops close, affective ties within the family and the child's sense of belonging to the family. It also results in the child becoming strongly dependent on the mother to satisfy his/her needs and, in turn, enables the mother to use various deprivation techniques to control the child's behavior. Moreover, even as the Asian-American mother caters to the needs of her child, she inculcates the child with a sense of obligation, which she continues to reinforce as the child grows older. Consequently, she is able to use shame and guilt to control behavior by appealing to this sense of obligation whenever

the child deviates from her expectations.

Despite their seemingly permissive child-rearing methods, Asian-American mothers are able to use the non-physical disciplinary techniques described above, together with limited amounts of physical punishment, very effectively to control their children's behavior. Although much childish behavior is tolerated, aggression, especially fighting, is strongly disapproved of and quickly admonished. Mothers maintain close supervision over all of their children's activities, carefully selecting their playmates and rarely leaving them alone or on their own. This protective care is reflected in the low childhood accident rates suffered by Asian-American children (Kurokawa, 1966).

Although their role appears to be increasing, most Asian-American fathers still play a relatively minor role in the rearing of children during their years of infancy. Since the time the father spends with his children is usually quite limited, he tends to take a rather tolerant attitude toward them, leaving most of the disciplining to the mother. However, when the children reach school age, they are no longer indulged and begin to assume duties and responsibilities in the household. They are also subjected to stricter discipline and taught in various ways that their actions will reflect not only on themselves but on the entire family. In cases of serious misbehavior by older children, the disciplining is often done by the father since his authority evokes greater fear and respect. He now also spends more time with the children, particularly if they are boys, joining them in recreational activities and having them assist with chores around the house.

As Asian-American children reach adolescence, many of them join peer groups and begin showing interest in the opposite sex. Their friends are now even more carefully screened by the parents. Dating among Asian-American teenagers is often on a group basis, whereby girls and boys go out as a group without necessarily pairing off. Many do not date on an individual basis until later;

in fact, group dating patterns sometimes persist even into college.

Parental attitudes toward pre-marital sexual exploration are still relatively strict, but are becoming more tolerant. In fact, it is not uncommon to find unmarried couples living together among Asian-American college students. However, while marriages among Asian Americans today are based on romantic love and free choice, parents still exert considerable influence on their children in this matter.

Kinship and Community

The nuclear family consisting of the parents and their children is the norm today among Asian-American families. However, close ties are still maintained with many relatives outside the immediate residential family through frequent visits and telephone calls, mutual assistance, reciprocal gift-giving and various social get-togethers. The bonds appear particularly strong between married sisters and between a mother and her married daughters. While grandparents generally do not live with their married children, they often live nearby and become quite involved with their children's families.

Due to the extent and closeness of these ties, the Asian-American family has been referred to as a modified extended family (Johnson, 1972). Although it is residentially nuclear, it is, in many respects, functionally extended. Such patterns appear to be particularly prevalent among Japanese families in Hawaii. To a lesser extent, they are also found among second- and third-generation Asian-American families on the West coast (Kiefer, 1974; Nee and Nee, 1972) and in other areas, such as New York City, where there are relatively high concentrations of Asian Americans.

Strongly complementing these family ties are the extensive networks of affiliations and communications that exist in the Asian-American communities. These include both informal networks, such as family friends and social groups,

and formal networks, such as ethnic newspapers, churches, family and business associations, recreational clubs, and various other community organizations (Hsu, 1971; Kiefer, 1974). Many of these formal networks are outgrowths of those originally established by the early Asian immigrants through their adaptations of the Chinese clan and Japanese dozoku systems of kinship. In recent years, as numerous national Asian-American organizations have come into being, similar networks are developing even at the national level.

It is these networks that make the Asian-American communities very close-knit social entities. They strongly reinforce the sanctioning techniques of the family for controlling behavior by serving as very effective channels for gossip and news about both misdeeds and achievements of individuals in the community. Through such communications, the "good families" and "bad families" are readily identified. Thus, community members are quite aware that their actions will become widely known and ultimately reflect on their families' reputations.

Recent Chinese Immigrant Families

Since 1965 when discriminatory immigration quotas were finally eliminated, well over 200,000 Chinese immigrants have entered the United States, principally from Hong Kong and Taiwan. Most of them crowded into the Chinatowns of San Francisco, New York City, Boston and other major cities. A number of these Chinatowns are stricken with some of the worst conditions to be found in any of the inner-city ghettoes, including overcrowded and dilapidated housing, grossly inadequate health care, chronic underemployment, increasing crime and delinquency, and a multitude of other pressing social problems (Chin, 1971; Wong, 1971; Lyman, 1974).

The families of these immigrants must contend with circumstances quite different from those faced by earlier Asian immigrant families. Parents no

longer work and live with their children in small business establishments, but are now generally wage workers in restaurants, garment factories, and other large enterprises employing unskilled laborers. Due to their subsistence-level wages, both parents are usually forced to work in order to make ends meet. They often work 10 hours a day, 6 days a week, not infrequently at night. Consequently, they have precious little time left over to spend with their children and must live under poverty conditions (Chao, 1977).

While parents appear to still believe in many of the traditional values and child-rearing practices (Young, 1972; Sollenberger, 1968), they can no longer always rely on traditional techniques for controlling the behavior of their children. Unlike earlier Asian immigrants, most of the recent immigrants have come from urban areas, which have experienced major changes under the impact of modernization and Western influences. Values and lifestyles have undergone corresponding changes. Furthermore, in the urban inner-city environments of the Chinatowns, the youth come under many outside influences in their neighborhood, in school and through the mass media, and, consequently, are far more knowledgeable about the society in which they live.

All of these factors have subjected the recent Chinese immigrant families to severe strains. Due to the absence of their parents and traditional constraints, the teenage youth of these families have been especially prone to acts of rebellion and social deviance. Since many of them cannot speak English and encounter both language and cultural barriers at school, they frequently become alienated from school, drop out and join their peers in street gangs (Sung, 1977). A large number of such gangs have formed over the past few years in most of the major Chinatowns and have been increasingly involved in crime and acts of violence, including an estimated 45 killings attributed to inter-gang warfare (Wu, 1977; Rice, 1977).

These families also suffer from some of the highest rates of infant mor-

tality and tuberculosis in the country. Furthermore, there are signs that mental illness and suicide may be becoming serious problems. Many of these families may ultimately become trapped in a cycle of poverty inasmuch as the adult members are finding themselves in low-paying, dead-end jobs with little or no chance for upward mobility, and many of the young males are not able to find employment at all. These problems are severely exacerbated by the language and cultural barriers, which prevent immigrants from gaining access to social services and job programs. Consequently, the disintegration of these families has already begun and will undoubtedly continue, perhaps at an accelerated pace, unless their conditions of poverty are ameliorated soon (Sung, 1976).

IMPACT OF THE SCHOOLS ON THE ASIAN-AMERICAN FAMILY

Having described the revisionist critique of American education and the modal characteristics of the Asian-American family, we are now prepared to examine the impact of the schools on the Asian-American family. We shall undertake this examination by first reassessing the effects of schooling on Asian Americans in light of the revisionist interpretation. This reassessment will be followed by an analysis of family/school discontinuities encountered by Asian-American students. The consequences of these discontinuities will then be discussed through a delineation of the problems and issues currently being faced by Asian Americans in education. Finally, we shall conclude this section with some comments on the dialectical nature of family/school interactions.

Reassessing the Effects of Schooling on Asian Americans[4]

Asian Americans would appear to be the nearly ideal exemplification of the meritocratic thesis. They are one of the most highly educated ethnic groups in the country and their median family income is higher than that of whites (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973). Yet, a little more than a generation ago, they were near the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder and one of the most intensely despised racial minorities (Miller, 1969; Ogawa, 1971).

Their seemingly phenomenal rise in socioeconomic status has generally been attributed to their emphasis on education and to their cultural characteristics: strong family structure, Protestant-like work ethic and high achievement motivation (Caudill and DeVos, 1956; Peterson, 1971; Hsu, 1971; Light, 1972). According to this explanation, they were able to get better jobs because of their higher education and because their values, such as respect for

[4]This analysis is presented in greater detail in an earlier paper (Suzuki, 1977).

authority and parental wishes, self-discipline, neatness, punctuality and diligence, were highly compatible with American middle-class values and viewed favorably by members of the majority group, especially employers.

However, the revisionist analysis of schooling in American society outlined earlier raises some profoundly disturbing questions about the adequacy of such an explanation. What has been the effect of schooling on the socialization of Asian Americans? Are Asian Americans really as successful as they appear? Why haven't Asian Americans fit into the stratification patterns posited by the revisionists, particularly in view of their long history as an oppressed racial minority? Moreover, in the face of such discrimination, why did Asian Americans invest so heavily in education in the first place? It is my intent here to explore possible answers to these questions by presenting an alternative explanation which, I believe, may provide us with a fuller understanding of the effects of schooling on Asian Americans.

This alternative explanation will be developed around three propositions, the first of which may be stated thus:

> Proposition 1: The personality traits exhibited by Asian Americans are the result of a socialization process in which the schools play a major role through their selective reinforcement of certain cultural behavior patterns and inculcation of others that are deemed "appropriate" for lower-echelon white-collar wage workers.

This proposition is strongly suggested by the striking similarities in the personality traits of Asian Americans and those of individuals from working-class backgrounds. A number of studies have revealed that such traits as obedience, conformity, punctuality and respect for authority are characteristic of many Asian Americans (Sue and Sue, 1971; Fenz and Arkoff, 1962; Yamamoto, 1968; Weiss, 1970). For example, Sue (1973) found that:

> Because of their practical and applied approach to life problems, (Asian Americans) tend to be more intolerant of ambiguities and to feel much more comfortable in well-structured situations. Asian Americans also appear less autonomous and less independent from parental controls and authority figures. They are more obedient, conservative, conforming and inhibited.

Very similar traits have been found to characterize children from white, working-class families (Kohn, 1969; Edwards, 1977). As discussed earlier, Bowles and Gintis and other educational sociologists believe that these traits are produced in working-class children through their socialization in the family and the schools. The logical extension of their reasoning suggests that similar influences may be at work in the personality development of Asian Americans.

This brings us to the second proposition which addresses the question of whether Asian Americans are, indeed, as successful as they appear.

> Proposition 2: Although they have attained high levels of education, the upward mobility of Asian Americans has been limited by the effects of racial discrimination and most of them have been channeled into lower-echelon, white-collar jobs having little or no decision-making authority, low mobility and low public contact.

While this proposition appears to be in contradiction to the fact cited earlier that Asian Americans have a higher median family income than do families in the population as a whole, it becomes plausible when the incomes of individuals rather than those of families are examined. Recent studies have shown that the median income of Asian-American males fall substantially below that of white males if adjustments are made for such demographic variables as education, age and geographic location (Sung, 1976; Suzuki, 1977; Cabezas, 1977).

The apparent contradiction between the relatively low median incomes of Asian males and the relatively high median income of Asian families may be explained primarily by the fact that a larger proportion of Asian families have two or more earners than do families in the population as a whole (Urban Associates, 1974). Moreover, the higher median incomes of Asian families may be due to regional differences and, thus, more apparent than real (Fong and Cabezas, 1976).

The disparity that exists between the incomes of Asian males and those of white males indicates that Asian males, on the whole, are underemployed, underpaid, or both; and that education does not gain nearly as much earning

power for them as it does for white males. Thus, the apparent "success" of Asian Americans is rather deceptive and not nearly as phenomenal as it may at first appear.

What is suggested by the second proposition is that the upward mobility of Asian Americans has been limited by racial discrimination and the relegation of Asian Americans to lower-echelon white-collar occupations. This thesis appears to be supported by hearings and investigations that have revealed that subtle employment discrimination against Asian Americans is pervasive in both the public and private sectors (Governor's Asian-American Advisory Committee, 1973; California FEPC, 1970; California Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1975). It is also supported by some limited data which show that the occupational scores of Asian Americans are considerably below those of whites (Cabezas, 1977).

Finally, the third and last proposition addresses the questions of why Asian Americans have not fit into the stratification patterns posited by the revisionists and why they have invested so heavily in education.

> Proposition 3: The limited upward mobility of Asian Americans was achieveable because of the demand for workers to fill lower-echelon white-collar jobs created by post World War II expansion in the technological and bureaucratic sectors of the economy and because Asians were almost ideally qualified for these jobs through the type of training and socialization they had acquired both in the home and school.

In order to provide a plausible rationale for this proposition, I shall briefly examine the socio-historical experience of Asians in the United States, and speculate on the ways in which that experience may have influenced their outlook on American society, particularly their attitudes toward education.

Due to discriminatory laws and practices, the early Asian immigrants were denied entry into craft and other unions and barred from employment in most white-owned businesses. As a consequence, they saw no future for themselves as blue-collar wage workers and were forced to become independent farmers or

to open their own businesses and develop their own largely self-sufficient communities--the Chinatowns and Little Tokyos--which could meet most of the needs of the Asian populaces. However, as self-employed entrepreneurs occupying the lower rungs of the stratified system, most of them were forced to wage a continuous struggle against the harshest of conditions in order to eke out a living (Barth, 1964; Daniels, 1962).

In order to survive this ordeal, Asian parents probably felt it was necessary to inculcate their children with some of the more authoritarian aspects of traditional cultural values such as filial piety, respect for parental authority, obedience and self-discipline. At the same time, they doubtlessly hoped for a better way of life for their children. Since very few other options existed, they very likely saw schooling as one of the only avenues left for their children's upward mobility. This almost desperate faith in schooling was undoubtedly reinforced by the traditional veneration accorded to education in Asian societies. The schools, in turn, reaffirmed this faith by rewarding the compliance, good behavior, perseverance and docility of Asian children and by instilling in them the dream that everyone had an equal chance to succeed in American society.

Due to their marginal position in the class structure outside the wage economy, we can speculate that the Asian entrepreneurial class, despite their low economic status, gradually developed an outlook on American society corresponding to that of a petit bourgeoisie. This outlook and their past experiences with the racism of white workers led them to shun possible futures for their children in blue-collar occupations, and, instead, to aspire toward white-collar professions for their children. However, the realities of racial discrimination imposed practical limits on these aspirations and led them to encourage their children to choose careers in lower-echelon white-collar occupational areas, especially in the technical-scientific areas.

Thus through this process we can hypothesize that Asian Americans came to acquire the values and skills that uniquely suited them for lower-echelon white-collar jobs. A high demand for masses of workers to fill such jobs was created in the two decades following World War II as a result of the enormous expansion in the technological/bureaucratic sectors of the economy (O'Connor, 1973; Mills, 1951). Asian Americans were almost ideally prepared to meet this demand since so many of them had been trained in the appropriate areas. They were also probably viewed by employers as having the almost ideal personality traits for these jobs as a result of their socialization in the home and through their extended years of schooling.

Family/School Discontinuities

While the analysis just presented is currently supported by limited empirical evidence, I believe it does strongly suggest that we must pay far more attention to the socialization function of schools and its resulting impact on the family. Therefore, in order to further explicate this aspect of schooling, I wish to examine more closely the family/school discontinuities in socialization patterns, values and language codes, as well as the structural barriers that exacerbate these discontinuities.

Discontinuities in socialization patterns. Certain continuities may be identified between the socialization patterns of the Asian-American family and those of the schools. As discussed earlier, the schools appear to reinforce certain behavioral patterns, such as respect for and obedience to authority, conformity, self-discipline, neatness and punctuality, that are also emphasized in the Asian-American family. However, these socialization patterns in the schools are not accompanied by the diffuseness and dependency that characterize social relations in the family.

In discussing the effects of schooling on children in general, Dreeban (1968) suggests that schooling socializes the child to develop orientations

of specificity rather than diffuseness and independence rather than dependence. Social relations in the family tend to be diffuse to the extent that one's significance for another is defined in terms of his/her entire personality and a broad range of shared activities and interests; whereas, in the schools they tend to be specific since a single teacher must deal with too many children to know them all as "whole" persons and must treat and judge them by a relatively narrow range of standardized criteria. Moreover, social relations in the family tend to be dependent to the extent that members help one another when obstacles are met; whereas, in the schools children are expected to work alone since helping one another is viewed as "cheating."

These discontinuities appear to be particularly severe for Asian-American children since relationships in their families tend to be very close, affective and highly dependent. While these discontinuities are difficult enough to handle for children from middle-class Anglo families, they are often traumatic and sometimes even devastating for children from Asian-American families. In view of the insecurities they experience, it is not surprising that many Asian Americans have been found to be undergoing considerable psychological stress and to be more conforming, obedient, conservative and inhibited than their Anglo peers.

This analysis of the effects of discontinuities may also provide some insight into the so-called "cultural conflicts" that often break out between Asian-American children and their parents, particularly within families of recent immigrants. The popular thesis is that these conflicts arise because Asian children are socialized by the schools to become more independent and autonomous from their families. While this may, indeed, occur, these children may, in turn, simply become regimented and conforming to a different set of rules, regulations and values promulgated by the schools. Worse yet, they may shift their loyalty and respect from their parents to authority figures

in the schools. In actuality, such cultural conflicts may arise because in the process of "Americanizing" these children, the schools subtly denigrate the values and behavior of their parents.

The discontinuities described above may also have some pedagogical implications for Asian-American children. Studies have shown that Asian-American and other minority children have distinctive learning styles that are quite different from those of middle-class Anglo children (Stodolsky and Lesser, 1967; Steward and Steward, 1973; Ramirez and Castaneda, 1974). These differences appear to be related to differences in socialization patterns, but are rarely taken into account by teachers in devising their instructional approaches. It is possible that family/school discontinuities in socialization patterns may partly explain why Asian-American students perform better in some subjects than in others. While little is presently known, further studies into this phenomenom certainly appear warranted.

Discontinuities in values. There are some rather complex and subtle interactions between the values of the Asian-American family and those of the schools. On the one hand, as we have mentioned, Asian-American students have been found to be more conforming, obedient, conservative and inhibited than their middle-class Anglo peers, who, in contrast, appear to be more individualistic, independent, assertive and spontaneous. These differences in the behavior patterns of the two groups may be partly attributed to differences in the values of their respective families.

On the other hand, as we have discussed, the schools selectively reinforce certain cultural behavioral patterns, such as conformity, obedience, punctuality and respect for authority, that are emphasized in the Asian-American family. Since most teachers would probably be quite content with Asian-American students who are quiet, well-behaved and obedient, they are quite likely to reward them for such behavior. Thus, while Asian-American students may often encounter

sharp value conflicts with their middle-class Anglo peers, many of their values receive positive reinforcement in the schools (Schwartz, 1971).

Perhaps the more severe value discontinuities experienced by Asian-American students arise from the strongly Anglo-centric orientation of the schools. The curriculum of most schools still conveys the impression that the only people of consequence in this country have been white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant. The experiences and contributions of Asian Americans are rarely, if ever, mentioned in curriculum materials; when information is presented, it usually is meager, superficial or condescending, and often perpetuates time-worn stereotypes. These biases, omissions and distortions in the school curriculum can subtly denigrate the self-image of Asian-American students and thereby have detrimental effects on their psychological development.

Discontinuities in language codes. We have already noted that verbalization is relatively restrained within Asian-American families, and that there is greater utilization of non-verbal and indirect modes of communication. This pattern manifests itself in the schools in the noticeable reticence of Asian-American students in expressing themselves. It is reinforced by the above-described discontinuities in socialization patterns and values which many Asian-American students find intimidating. They become reluctant to express themselves for fear of inviting ridicule or hostility (Watanabe, 1973).

In Bernstein's (1971) terms, the language code of these students is restricted as opposed to elaborated. In the restricted code, vocabulary and syntax are relatively narrow in range, the organizing elements of speech are simple, and there is considerable dependence on extra-verbal modes of communication. In the elaborated code, vocabulary and syntax are wider in range, the organizing elements are more complex, and there is little reliance on extra-verbal modes of communication. According to Bernstein, a child from a middle-class family is more likely to be exposed to and acquire an elaborated language

code; and a child from a lower-class family, a restricted language code. Since the school is predominantly concerned with elaborated language codes, the lower-class child is at a distinct disadvantage to his/her middle-class peers.

The disadvantage is often greater for Asian-American students since many teachers stereotype them as quiet, nonassertive and passive and rarely direct questions to them or encourage them to engage in dialogue. In fact, some teachers are likely to over-react when they encounter an Asian-American student who breaks the stereotype by being verbal and assertive. Such a student may be perceived by the teacher as disruptive or a disciplinary problem even though his/her behavior may be quite typical of the non-Asian students in the class.

A problem that is undoubtedly closely related to the underdevelopment of their verbal skills is the serious deficiencies exhibited by Asian Americans in their reading and English composition skills. One study at a major university having a high concentration of Asian-American students revealed that their failure rate on the entrance examination which tests for basic competence in these skills was more than double that of other students (Watanabe, 1973). Other studies of the performance of Asian Americans on standard achievement tests have also indicated that such deficiencies exist (Coleman, 1966).

One other problem that merits concern is the disproportionate number of Asian Americans who pursue careers in the technical/scientific disciplines such as engineering, accounting, mathematics and the physical sciences. A survey of majors at the University of California at Berkeley, where over 10 percent of the students are Asian Americans, revealed that approximately 70 percent of the Asian-American males matriculated in these fields over a 20-year period (Chu, 1971). A similar trend appears to exist at other institutions.

While socialization within the family, parental desires and fear of discrimination may all be relevant factors, it seems clear that the schools play

an influential role in this trend. Because of the underdevelopment of their verbal and writing skills, Asian Americans are probably attracted to these disciplines, which require minimal capabilities in self-expression and communication. They undoubtedly also are channeled in this direction by teachers and guidance counselors.

Structural barriers. The family/school discontinuities described above are exacerbated by the organization of modern school systems. The large, impersonal bureaucracies of these systems are ostensibly designed for efficiency and centralized control. Such systems tend to generate standardized policies, procedures and curriculum that are often biased toward Anglo-conformity and imposed unilaterally with little concern for differences among schools, much less among pupils. They also are quite unresponsive to parents and local communities and are extremely difficult to change. Thus, parents become discouraged in their attempts to influence and participate in the schools.

The organization of the schools also discourages teachers and administrators from trying to increase their contacts with parents. They are normally overburdened with other tasks and are able to give little priority to increasing family/school interactions and easing family/school discontinuities.

Current Problems and Issues

Many of the problems and issues currently being faced by Asian Americans in education can hopefully be better understood in terms of the revisionist analysis and family/school discontinuities that were discussed in the foregoing subsections. We shall now attempt to delineate these problems and issues in what we believe are the major areas of educational concern to Asian Americans. These are: (1) bilingual/bicultural education, (2) multicultural education, (3) adult education, (4) higher education and (5) parental involvement in education.

In this subsection, we shall drop our usage of the term, Asian American, and speak more generally of Pacific/Asian Americans since our delineation of problems and issues will, for the most part, be applicable to all of the groups usually subsumed under this broader designation.

Bilingual/bicultural education. It has been estimated that approximately 50 percent of the current population of Pacific/Asian Americans are recent immigrants who have arrived in this country since 1965 when discriminatory immigration restrictions were finally lifted. They encompass many ethnic and national groups, as well as numerous linguistic groups. Many of these recent arrivals are non-English speaking and face formidable language and cultural barriers in all spheres of life. The lack of English competency severely limits their employment opportunities, discourages them from venturing outside of the inner-city ethnic ghettoes, creates serious and often dysfunctional family/school discontinuities, alienates many of them from pursuing their education, and may be partly the cause of the increasing rates of school dropouts and juvenile delinquency.

Current bilingual/bicultural education programs for Pacific/Asian Americans are underfinanced in comparison to programs for other non-English speaking groups. Due to the lack of resources, many programs appear to be fragmented and uncoordinated, and much must still be learned about the most appropriate and effective methods and materials. The educational needs of large numbers of non-English speaking Pacific/Asian Americans are still not being met because of the lack of qualified bilingual/bicultural education teachers and properly designed curriculum materials.

Multicultural education. Due to the Anglo-centric orientation of most American schools, Pacific/Asian American students often undergo traumatic family/school discontinuities, leading them to denigrate their own subculture, parents and self-concept. Teachers are often quite insensitive to the special

problems, needs and unique learning styles of Pacific/Asian-American students. Moreover, the curriculum of most schools either completely ignores the experiences and contributions of Pacific/Asian Americans, or misrepresents and stereotypes them. Such biases in the schools contribute not only to conflicts in Pacific/Asian-American families, but also to the perpetuation of racism, sexism and interethnic conflict within the larger society. Indirectly, they also lead to negative attitudes toward Pacific/Asians generally and thereby deleteriously affect relationships between Pacific/Asian countries and the United States.

Multicultural education has been conceived as an educational approach that would assist in alleviating these problems. It is intended to help reduce dysfunctional family/school discontinuities, provide multiple learning environments that properly match the academic and social needs of students, depolarize conflicts between ethnic groups, and increase the students' understanding of the causes of racism, sexism and poverty.

Unfortunately, present conceptualizations of multicultural education are often ill-defined and have conflicting purposes and priorities. This state of affairs has led many well-intentioned teachers to implement multicultural education in rather superficial ways; e.g., by simply incorporating ethnic foods, holidays and role models into their curriculums. Consequently, most multicultural education programs are not having the expected impact and there is considerable confusion and misdirection in the field. This has led many educators to view multicultural education as just another educational fad that will soon fade away, particularly if it is ignored.

Adult education. This area of education is primarily concerned with the problems being faced by adults who are recent immigrants and are non-English speaking. Most of them must seek gainful employment immediately upon their arrival, yet, at the same time, are urgently in need of gaining competency in English and learning a new vocation. However, they have neither the time nor

the money to take regular English classes or enroll in job training programs. Under such circumstances, they often find themselves trapped in low-paying, dead-end and menial jobs.

All of these problems are exacerbated for young adults in their late teens and early twenties, who have dropped out of school. Since they speak little English, have no high school diploma and no job experience, their prospects of finding a decent job are practically nil and large numbers of them are unemployed. Many of them end up joining one of the many street gangs which have formed in recent years, particularly in the Chinatowns, and have been increasingly engaged in crime and acts of violence.

One other Pacific/Asian group for which adult education programs are needed is the wives and former wives of U.S. servicemen. These women must not only make a difficult adjustment to a new lifestyle in the United States, but must often also find jobs to help support their families. However, they usually have very limited English competency and no formal training to enable them to obtain decent jobs.

Higher education. Due to the emphasis Pacific/Asian Americans place on education, large numbers of them can be expected to aspire to go on to college. However, they face a multitude of problems in this area. It appears that most Pacific/Asian Americans will continue to be channelled into or gravitate toward the technical/scientific disciplines and develop their potentialities within a relatively narrow range of options. They will also undoubtedly continue to face considerable psychological stress in the competitive, Anglo-centric academic environment characteristic of most colleges. While Asian-American studies programs have been established on a few campuses, not nearly enough programs and courses are available to meet the social, psychological and academic needs of Pacific/Asian-American students.

In recent years, increasing numbers of Pacific/Asian-American students

from low-income/recent-immigrant families have been recruited for college through special programs that provide them with financial aid. Unfortunately, most of them are ill-prepared for college and often do not receive sufficient tutorial and remedial assistance once they are on campus and, therefore, many of them drop out after a semester or two.

Due to the escalating costs of college, most middle-income Pacific/Asian-American families, like many other middle-income families, are finding it increasingly difficult to send their children on to college. The financial burdens are particularly onerous for Pacific/Asian-American families because they must exert much more effort than their Anglo counterparts to achieve their middle-income status. Moreover, Pacific/Asian-American parents are often willing to make sacrifices that are almost unheard of in Anglo families in order to obtain a college education for their children. Unfortunately, none of these special circumstances are considered in financial aid programs and, consequently, few students from middle-income Pacific/Asian-American families qualify for grants or scholarships. Furthermore, many institutions and foundations do not consider Pacific/Asian-American students as "disadvantaged" and, therefore, exclude them from consideration in their financial aid programs for minority students.

Finally, we wish to mention the problems being encountered by Pacific/Asian Americans who are pursuing or wish to pursue academic careers in higher education. Despite affirmative action, many of them are finding it difficult to gain access to available faculty positions. It also appears that American-born Pacific/Asians are considerably under-represented on the faculties of most colleges and universities. Moreover, studies have shown that Pacific/Asian-American faculty are on the average paid substantially below both their white and black colleagues, despite the fact that their records of academic achievements are usually superior (Sowell, 1975).

Parental involvement in education. Because of the respect they have traditionally accorded to educators, Pacific/Asian-American parents are often reluctant to intervene in the education of their children even when they may be dissatisfied with it. This reluctance is often compounded by the insensitivity many teachers exhibit toward the special problems and needs of Pacific/Asian-American children.

Pacific/Asian-American parents are also discouraged from becoming involved in the education of their children by the structural barriers discussed earlier. Since both parents commonly work in Pacific/Asian-American families, they often are unable to attend parent/teacher conferences and PTA meetings. Moreover, given their past unpleasant encounters with the institutions of the larger society, many of them mistrust and are intimidated by the large, impersonal bureaucracies characteristic of most modern school systems.

Dialectical Perspective

As a small, powerless minority group, Asian Americans have often had to accommodate to the indomitable forces of the larger society, even as they struggled for self-determination and the maintenance of their own way of life. This complex, dialectical interplay of necessity and autonomy in the lives of Asian Americans has produced both strengths and weaknesses in their families.

In the preceding subsection, we necessarily dwelled on pathological aspects in order to delineate the current problems and issues facing Asian-American families. It should not be implied from that discussion that these families do not also possess many strengths and commendable qualities, nor that they were simply the hapless pawns of elitist control of the schools. Despite such control, the fact is that Asian Americans were able to utilize schooling as an avenue--perhaps the only one available to them--for at least a limited degree of upward mobility. Currently, an important countervailing force to such

control is the Asian-American movement, which has played a major role over the past decade in raising the social consciousness of Asian Americans and in leading them toward collective action in attempts to gain control over their own destinies (Wong, 1972; Jacobs and Landau, 1971; Suzuki, 1977a).

Moreover, whether a given familial characteristic is viewed as a strength or a weakness may depend very much on the eyes of the perceiver. For example, the unity, stability and cohesiveness of the Asian-American family are widely viewed as its major strengths. These characteristics are thought by many to explain the low social deviance, high educational attainment and relatively favorable status of Asian Americans. On the other hand, others believe that these same characteristics, within the context of a highly racially-conscious society, have socialized Asian Americans into becoming conforming, unassertive, inhibited and conservative. As discussed earlier, this socialization may explain why so many Asian Americans are experiencing severe mental strains and limited job mobility. Thus, from one perspective the above-mentioned characteristics of the Asian-American family may be seen as strengths which insure stability, order and progress in society; whereas, from another perspective, they may be seen as weaknesses which insure the passivity, accommodation and subordination of Asian Americans.

Judgments of whether certain cultural characteristics are strengths or weaknesses may also depend on the societal context in which they are made. Many Asian-American cultural values and behavioral patterns, such as their group orientation, restraint of strong feelings, and modesty and politeness toward others, may be seen as highly compatible with a society oriented toward cooperation, harmony and non-materialistic ethics. On the other hand, they may be seen as highly incompatible with a society oriented toward individualism, competition and materialism.

The point of the above discussion is simply that judgments about the strengths

and weaknesses of families are very dependent on one's value orientation. We should, therefore, be quite suspicious of any claims to a purely rational, value-free approach for prescribing policies on the family. Such policies must ultimately rest on some underlying ideological, ethical or moral bases (Schumacher, 1973; Connolly, 1974).

SUMMARY AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In this concluding section, we shall summarize our entire preceding discussion of education and the Asian-American family, undertake a retrospective analysis of what we have learned from the Asian-American experience, and, finally, present a number of policy recommendations for guiding legislative action in the area of education based on our analysis of the Asian-American family.

Education and the Asian-American Family: A Summary

Several broad generalizations may be drawn from our discussion of education and the Asian-American family:

1. Despite its many shortcomings, the revisionist interpretation of American educational history has provided a much-needed alternative perspective that is producing new insights into the socialization function of the schools. Recent analyses from this perspective have seriously challenged the widely-held belief that the American educational system functions meritocratically.
2. Although the Asian-American family is commonly characterized as patriarchical, husbands and wives appear to enjoy a more egalitarian relationship than do their Anglo counterparts. However, except during early childhood, Asian-American parents tend to impose stricter discipline on their children. Verbal interaction between family members is relatively restrained, but there appears to be greater utilization of extra-verbal modes of communication.
3. By middle-class Anglo norms, Asian-American mothers tend to indulge, if not spoil, their infant children. However, due to the close, affective ties that result from such upbringing, mothers are able to very effectively employ non-physical sanctions, such as shame and deprivation, to control their children's behavior.

4. By instilling their children with a strong sense of obligation to the family and with the idea that their actions will reflect not only on themselves but on the entire family, Asian-American parents are able to maintain a high degree of social control over their children. This control is strongly reinforced by the extensive networks of affiliations and communications within the Asian-American communities.
5. The families of recent immigrants constitute a significant proportion of all Chinese-American families. Most of them live in congested Chinatown ghettoes where they must contend with chronic underemployment, grossly inadequate health care, and overcrowded and dilapidated housing. Growing rates of social deviance, especially crime and delinquency, indicate that these families are experiencing serious deterioration. Language and cultural barriers deter their access to social services and job training programs that could, otherwise, help ameliorate some of these problems.
6. Although the educational level and median family income of Asian Americans are among the highest of any ethnic group, closer analysis reveals that Asian-American males are still paid less than their Anglo counterparts when such demographic variables as education, geographic location and age are controlled. We have tried to explain this disparity by positing that as a result of their socialization both in the family and in the schools and because of subtle discrimination, Asian Americans are usually relegated to lower-echelon white-collar jobs.
7. Asian-American students often experience severe family/school discontinuities due to differences in the socialization patterns, values and language codes of their families and those of the schools. These differences are exacerbated by the structural barriers that discourage parental involvement in the schools. We have tried to explicate the complex, subtle nature of these family/school interactions.

8. Some of the major educational concerns of Pacific/Asian Americans are in the areas of bilingual/bicultural education, multicultural education, adult education, higher education and parental involvement in education. We have tried to delineate the current problems and issues in each of these areas. These problems and issues will be addressed by the policy recommendations presented in the last subsection of this paper.

In concluding this summary, we wish to reiterate our earlier caveat: The generalizations about the Asian-American family presented above should not be misused to stereotype all Asian-American families. Given the wide variations that exist among these families, one can be certain that many of them will not fit our modal description.

Retrospective Analysis

Prior to presenting our policy recommendations, it seems appropriate to attempt a critical analysis of what we have learned about the family through the Asian-American experience. This analysis will be approached through a general conceptual framework which encompasses the three broad influences that shape and direct the development of any ethnic group's families. These are (a) the cultural background of the ethnic group, (b) the socio-historical forces experienced by that ethnic group, and (c) the stage in the bio-social development of the various subgroups within that ethnic group.

Cultural background refers to an ethnic group's values, beliefs, behavioral patterns, family structure, kinship system, etc. Most studies on ethnic families seem to focus primarily on this dimension, leading to various theories which have sometimes been used to make invidious comparisons between ethnic groups based on differences in cultural background (Ryan, 1971; Valentine, 1968). For example, the social deviance of Asian Americans is low compared to other minority groups and has been attributed to their unique cultural characteris-

tics. However, if culture were the only determinant, it then becomes difficult to explain the alarming increase in delinquency among Chinese immigrant youth in recent years. These cultural theories are, of course, limited to the degree they ignore the other two major influences on the family.

Socio-historical forces refer to the impact on the family of the larger social system, including the schools, political and economic institutions, mass media, etc. The action of these forces must be examined not only in the present but also in the past in order to determine their cumulative effects on the family. For example, it is possible that the virulent anti-Chinese movement of the late 1800's has residual effects on Chinese Americans even today. And there are unquestionably residual effects of the wartime internment expeience on Japanese Americans today. However, like theories that focus only on culture, socio-historical analyses will be limited to the degree they do not consider the other two major influences.

Stage of bio-social development refers to the maturation level of an individual or group. While many theories of human development have been formulated (Reese and Overton, 1970; Sigel, 1972), most of them focus on the individual and assume that environmental conditions are primarily differentiated by culture; few, if any, consider interactions with socio-historical forces. Yet, such interactions have significantly and differentially affected the bio-social development of Asian Americans. For example, the Nisei responded quite differently from the Issei to the crisis of the wartime internment and also suffered different residual effects. To take a more general example, the impact of the turbulent decade of the 1960's on college students may be compared with that on their parents.

These three broad influences on the family should be seen as interacting with each other both in space and over time. Projections about the future of the family would require predicting the course of these interactions into the

foreseeable future. Given the complexities and independent proclivities of human behavior, such predictions have, in the past, often proven to be badly in error, especially in the case of minority groups (Lyman, 1968). For example, few, if any, sociologists anticipated the Black Revolt of the 1960's (Blauner, 1972). It is also highly unlikely that anyone predicted, even in 1940, that Japanese Americans would be incarcerated in concentration camps in 1942. Yet, each of these events had a profound influence on the families of each of these minority groups.

This discussion should make it clear that accurate projections about the future for the purpose of policy formulation are extremely difficult to make and often highly unreliable. This may be particularly true for minority-group families, which have often been severely affected by unexpected upheavals and crises. Therefore, we would probably be well advised to formulate policies on a tentative, provisional basis and question any highly specific prescriptions based on forecasts claiming scientific infallibility (Young, 1968).

The above analysis should also make it clear that the schools are only one of many forces that impact on the family. If we accept the revisionist viewpoint, they have more often been a conservative force against social change, than a progressive force for it. In fact, there are probably definite limits to social change through educational reform alone--limits that are determined primarily by the structural constraints imposed by the economic and political sectors of our society (Carnoy and Levin, 1976).

Policy Recommendations

In line with the precautionary points made in the preceding analysis, our policy recommendations will be kept rather general and should be considered tentative and provisional. It is expected that these recommendations will be relevant not only for Asian Americans, as we have defined them, but also for

all or most Pacific/Asian-American groups.

1. Existing Federal policies and programs in education should be carefully assessed to determine the ways in which they impact on Pacific/Asian-American families.
2. Educational programs designed to strengthen Pacific/Asian-American families should be approached cautiously and deliberately to ensure that they do not adversely interfere with their functioning. There should be sufficient flexibility designed into these programs so they can be swiftly modified or even eliminated if they prove ineffective or detrimental.
3. Federal funding of bilingual/bicultural education programs for Pacific/Asian Americans is presently inadequate and should be increased. More bilingual/bicultural education teachers need to be trained and more and better designed curriculum materials should be developed. There is also a need to conduct more sophisticated and thorough longitudinal evaluative studies of existing programs in order to develop more coherent, systematic and effective approaches to bilingual/bicultural education. Finally, more attention should be given in these programs to bicultural/multicultural aspects in order that Pacific/Asian-American students will be able to better understand the family/school discontinuities they are experiencing and to function more effectively within the complex, pluralistic milieu of the larger society.
4. More coherent, sound conceptualizations of multicultural education must be developed to better communicate its purpose and potentialities to educators. Funding should be substantially increased for the inservice training of teachers and the development of materials in order to broaden the implementation of multicultural education programs. Much more research should be conducted on ways of alleviating dysfunctional family/school discontinuities for Pacific/Asian-American students, on the nature of the learning styles of these students, and to identify instructional strategies, methods

and materials appropriate for these students.

5. Increased Federal funding is urgently needed for adult education programs for the following Pacific/Asian-American groups: recent immigrants, unemployed youth and wives of U.S. servicemen. In order to meet the different needs of these groups, a variety of well-conceived, innovative programs are needed that integrate English language and vocational training with culturally-sensitive approaches to job placement and family counseling.
6. A wide variety of approaches are needed to address the many problems facing Pacific/Asian Americans in higher education. Pre- and in-college career counseling programs should be developed to assist Pacific/Asian-American students in exploring and preparing themselves for a wider range of career options. More programs, such as Asian-American studies, bilingual tutoring and cross-cultural psychological counseling, should be offered to meet the social, psychological and academic needs of Asian-American students. Finally, affirmative action must be pursued more vigorously for Pacific/Asian Americans to ameliorate serious existing inequities.
7. Much more emphasis should be given in Federal programs to meaningful ways of increasing the involvement of Pacific/Asian-American parents in the education of their children. Educators must become more knowledgeable and sensitive to the special problems and needs of Pacific/Asian-American children and to the nature and functioning of Pacific/Asian-American families. Incentives should be given to teachers and administrators for placing greater emphasis on family/school relationships and on increasing parental involvement in the schools. School administrators should also be encouraged to experiment with ways of removing structural barriers between the schools and the family, such as smaller schools and decentralized modes of organization.

These few, broad recommendations will hopefully provide some general guide-

lines for the formulation of public policies and programs that will help, rather than hinder, the future development of Pacific/Asian-American families. From their past experiences, Pacific/Asian Americans are quite mindful of the enormous impact the government can have on their families. If policy- and decision-makers wish to avoid the mistakes of the past and develop policies and programs equitable to all groups, they must give serious consideration to what can be learned from the experiences and perspectives of Pacific/Asian Americans and other minorities. It is hoped that the description and analysis presented in the preceding pages will prove useful for this purpose and assist in the current quest for ways of strengthening and improving the quality of life for the families of all ethnic groups in American society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailyn, Bernard. 1960. Education in the Forming of American Society. Chappel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Barth, Gunther. 1964. Bitter Strength: A History of the Chinese in the United States, 1850-1870. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Beardsley, Richard K., John W. Hall and Robert E. Wood. 1959. Village Japan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Becker, Gary. 1964. Human Capital. New York: Columbia University Press.

Befu, Harumi. 1971. Japan: An Anthropological Introduction. New York: Chandler.

Benedict, Ruth. 1946. The Chrysanthemum and the Sword. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Bernstein, Basil. 1971. Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical Studies Toward a Sociology of Language. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bernstein, Basil. 1975. Class, Codes and Control. Volume 3: Toward a Theory of Educational Transmission. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Blauner, Robert. 1972. Racial Oppression in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1973. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction" in Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change, Richard Brown, ed. London: Tavistock.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1977. Reproduction: In Education, Society and Culture. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage.

Bowles, Samuel. 1972. "Getting Nowhere: Programmed Class Stagnation," Society, 9:42-49.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Broom, Leonard and John I. Kitsuse. 1956. The Managed Casualty: The Japanese-American Family in World War II. Berkeley: University of California Press Reprint, 1977.

Butts, R. Freeman. 1974. "Public Education and Political Community," History of Education Quarterly, 14:165-183.

Cabezas, Amado Y. 1977. "A View of Poor Linkages Between Education, Occupation and Earnings for Asian Americans," Paper presented at the Third National Forum on Education and Work, San Francisco, Ca.

California Advisory Committee. 1975. "Asian Americans and Pacific Peoples: A Case of Mistaken Identity," Report to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Los Angeles, Ca.

California FEPC. 1970. "Chinese in San Francisco, 1970: Employment Problems of the Community as Presented in Testimony Before the California Fair Employment Practice Commission," San Francisco, Ca.

Carnoy, Martin, ed. 1972. Schooling in a Corporate Society. New York: David McKay.

Carnoy, Martin and Henry M. Levin. 1976. The Limits of Educational Reform. New York: David McKay.

Caudill, William. 1952. "Japanese-American Personality and Acculturation," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 45(February):3-102.

Caudill, William and George DeVos. 1956. "Achievement, Culture and Personality: The Case of Japanese Americans," American Anthropologist, 58:1102-26.

Chao, Rose. 1977. Chinese Immigrant Children. Preliminary Report, Betty L. Sung, ed. New York: Department of Asian Studies, City University of New York.

Chin, Rocky. 1971. "New York Chinatown Today," Amerasia Journal, 1(March): 1-24.

Chu, R. 1971. "Majors of Chinese and Japanese Students at the University of California, Berkeley for the Past 20 Years," Project Report, AS 150, Asian Studies Division, University of California, Berkeley.

Cole, Michael and Jerome S. Bruner. 1971. "Cultural Differences and Inferences About Psychological Processes," American Psychologist, 26:867-876.

Coleman, James S., et al. 1966. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Collins, Randall. 1977. "Some Comparative Principles of Educational Stratification," Harvard Educational Review, 47(February):1-27.

Connolly, William E. 1974. "Theoretical Self-Consciousness" in Social Structure and Political Theory, William E. Connolly and Glen Gordon, eds. Lexington, Ma.: D.C. Heath and Co.

Cremin, Lawrence A. 1965. The Genius of American Education. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Cubberley, Ellwood. 1919. Public Education in the United States. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Daniels, Roger. 1962. The Politics of Prejudice: The Anti-Japanese Movement in California and the Struggle for Japanese Exclusion. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dowie, J. Iverne. 1964. "The American Negro: An Old Immigrant on a New Frontier" in In the Trek of the Immigrant, O.F. Ander, ed. Rock Island, Ill.: Augusta Historical Society.

Dreeban, Robert. 1968. On What is Learned in School. Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley.

Edwards, Richard C. 1977. "Personal Traits and 'Success' in Schooling and Work," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37:125-138.

Eisele, J. Christopher. 1975. "John Dewey and the Immigrants," History of Education Quarterly, 15:67-85.

Embree, John F. 1939. Suye Mura: A Japanese Village. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Featherstone, Joseph. 1977. "Commentaries on 'Schooling in Capitalist America'," History of Education Quarterly, 17(Summer):139-149.

Fenz, W. and A. Arkoff. 1962. "Comparative Need Patterns of Five Ancestry Groups in Hawaii," Journal of Social Psychology, 58:67-89.

Fong, Pauline and Amado Cabezas. 1976. "Economic and Employment Status of Asian-Pacific Women," Paper presented to The Conference on the Educational and Occupational Needs of Asian-Pacific Women, San Francisco, Ca.

Fong, Stanley L.M. 1973. "Assimilation and Changing Roles of Chinese Americans," Journal of Social Issues, 29(2):115-127.

Freedman, Maurice, ed. 1970. Family and Kinship in Chinese Society. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press.

Fuchs, Lawrence. 1961. Hawaii Pono: A Social History. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Fujimoto, Irene and Diane Wong. 1973. "The New Asian-American Woman" in Asian-Americans: Psychological Perspectives, Stanley Sue and Nathaniel N. Wagner, eds. Palo Alto, Ca.: Science & Behavior Books.

Governor's Asian-American Advisory Commission. 1973. "Report to the Governor on Discrimination Against Asians," Based on hearings conducted in Seattle, Wa.

Greer, Colin. 1972. The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education. New York: Basic Books.

Hammack, Floyd M. 1976. "Rethinking Revisionism," History of Education Quarterly, 16:58-64.

Handlin, Oscar. 1966. "The Goals of Integration," Daedalus, 95(2):268-286.

Hsu, Francis L.K. 1949. Under the Ancestor's Shadow. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hsu, Francis L.K. 1971. The Challenge of the American Dream: The Chinese in the United States. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth.

Ichihashi, Yamato. 1932. Japanese in the United States. New York: Arno Press Reprint, 1969.

Iga, Mamoru. 1957. "The Japanese Social Structure and the Source of Mental Strains of Japanese Immigrants in the United States," Social Forces, 35:271-278.

Jacobs, Paul and Saul Landau. 1971. To Serve the Devil. Vol. 2: Colonials and Sojourners. New York: Vintage.

Jencks, Christopher, et al. 1972. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Johnson, Colleen L. 1972. The Japanese-American Family and Community in Honolulu: Generational Continuities in Ethnic Affiliation. Ph.D. Dissertation in Anthropology. Syracuse: Syracuse University.

Kamin, Leon. 1974. The Science and Politics of IQ. Potomac, Md.: Erlbaum

Karier, Clarence J., Joel Spring and Paul C. Violas. 1973. Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Katz, Michael B. 1971. Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger.

Kiefer, Christie W. 1974. Changing Cultures, Changing Lives: An Ethnographic Study of Three Generations of Japanese Americans. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kitano, Harry H.L. 1969. Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Kohn, Melvin. 1969. Class and Conformity: A Study in Values. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

Kriger, Sara F. and William H. Kroes. 1972. "Child-rearing Attitudes of Chinese, Jewish, and Protestant Mothers," Journal of Social Psychology, 86:205-210.

Kung, S.W. 1962. Chinese in American Life. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Kurokawa, Minako. 1966. "Family Solidarity, Social Change and Childhood Accidents," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28(November):498-506.

Lang, Olga. 1946. Chinese Family and Society. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Lazerson, Marvin. 1973. "Revisionism and American Educational History," Harvard Educational Review, 43:269-283.

Lee, Rose H. 1960. The Chinese in the United States. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Leichter, Hope J. 1974. "Some Perspectives on the Family as Educator," Teachers College Record, 76(December):175-217.

Light, Ivan H. 1972. Ethnic Enterprise in America: Business and Welfare Among Chinese, Japanese and Blacks. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lowe, Pardee. 1943. Father and Glorious Descendant. Boston: Little Brown & Co.

Lyman, Stanford. 1968. "The Race Relations Cycle of Robert E. Park," Pacific Sociological Review, 2(Spring):16-22.

Lyman, Stanford. 1974. Chinese Americans. New York: Random House.

Masuoka, Jitsuichi. 1944. "The Life Cycle of an Immigrant Institution in Hawaii: The Family," Social Forces, 23(October):60-64.

Miller, Stuart C. 1969. The Unwelcome Immigrant: The American Image of the Chinese, 1785-1882. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 1951. White Collar: The American Middle Class. New York: Oxford University Press.

Morishima, James K. 1973. "The Evacuation: Impact on the Family" in Asian-Americans: Psychological Perspectives, Stanley Sue and Nathaniel N. Wagner, eds. Palo Alto, Ca.: Science & Behavior Books.

Nee, Victor and Brett D. Nee. 1972. Longtime Californ': A Documentary History of an American Chinatown. New York: Pantheon Books.

O'Connor, James. 1973. The Fiscal Crisis of the State. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ogawa, Dennis. 1971. From Japs to Japanese: The Evolution of Japanese-American Stereotypes. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan.

Ogawa, Dennis. 1973. Jan Ken Po: The World of Hawaii's Japanese Americans. Honolulu: Japanese American Research Center.

Okimoto, Daniel I. 1971. American in Disguise. New York: Walker/Weatherhill.

Peterson, William. 1966. "Success Story, Japanese-American Style," New York Times Magazine, January 9.

Peterson, William. 1971. Japanese Americans: Oppression and Success. New York: Random House.

Rameriz III, Manuel and Alfredo Castaneda. 1974. Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development and Education. New York: Academic Press.

Reese, H.W. and W.F. Overton. 1970. "Models of Development and Theories of Development" in Life Span Developmental Psychology, E.R. Goulet and P.B. Baltes, eds. New York: Academic Press.

Rice, Berkeley. 1977. "The New Gangs of Chinatown," Psychology Today, 10(May): 60-69.

Ryan, William. 1971. Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage Books.

Schultz, Theodore. 1963. The Economic Value of Education. New York: Columbia University Press.

Schumacher, E.F. 1973. Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered. New York: Harper & Row.

Schwartz, Audrey J. 1971. "The Culturally Advantaged: A Study of Japanese American Pupils," Sociology and Social Research, 55(April):341-353.

Sigel, Irving E. 1972. "Developmental Theory and Preschool Education: Issues, Problems and Implications" in Early Childhood Education, Ira J. Gordon, ed. 75th Yearbook. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Sollenberger, Richard T. 1968. "Chinese-American Child-rearing Practices and Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Social Psychology, 74:13-23.

Sowell, Thomas. 1975. Affirmative Action Reconsidered. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.

Spring, Joel H. 1972. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State. Boston: Beacon Press.

Steward, Margaret and David Steward. 1973. "The Observation of Anglo-, Mexican-, and Chinese-American Mothers Teaching Their Young Sons," Child Development, 44:329-337.

Stodolsky, Susan S. and Gerald Lesser. 1967. "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged," Harvard Educational Review, 37(Fall):546-593.

Sue, Derald W. 1973. "Ethnic Identity: The Impact of Two Cultures on the Psychological Development of Asians in America" in Asian-Americans: Psychological Perspectives, Stanley Sue and Nathaniel N. Wagner, eds. Palo Alto, Ca.: Science & Behavior Books.

Sue, Derald W. and Austin C. Frank. 1973. "A Typological Approach to the Psychological Study of Chinese and Japanese American College Males," Journal of Social Issues, 29(2):129-148.

Sue, Derald W. and B.A. Kirk. 1973. "Differential Characteristics of Japanese and Chinese American College Students," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20:142-148.

Sue, Stanley and Derald Sue. 1971. "Chinese-American Personality and Mental Health," Amerasia Journal, 1:36-49.

Sung, Betty L. 1967. The Story of the Chinese in America. New York: Collier Books.

Sung, Betty L. 1976. A Survey of Chinese-American Manpower and Employment. New York: Praeger.

Sung, Betty L. 1977. Gangs in New York's Chinatown. New York: Department of Asian Studies, City University of New York.

Suzuki, Bob H. 1977. "Education and the Socialization of Asian Americans: A Revisionist Analysis of the 'Model Minority' Thesis," Amerasia Journal, 4(2):23-51.

Suzuki, Bob H. 1977a. "The Japanese-American Experience" in In Praise of Diversity: A Resource Book for Multicultural Education, Milton J. Gold, Carl Grant and Harry N. Rivlin, eds. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators.

Thomas, D.S. and R. Nishimoto. 1946. The Spoilage: Japanese-American Evacuation and Resettlement During World War II. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tong, Ben. 1971. "Ghetto of the Mind: Notes on the Historical Psychology of Chinese America," Amerasia Journal, 1(3):1-32.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1972. Census of the Population: 1970. Subject Reports. Japanese, Chinese and Filipinos in the United States. Final Report PC(2)-1G. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Urban Associates, Inc. 1974. A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census. Vol. 2: Asian Americans. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Concerns, Dept. of HEW.

Urban, Wayne J. 1975. "Some Historiographical Problems in Revisionist Educational History: Review of 'Roots of Crisis'," American Educational Research Journal, 12:337-350.

Valentine, Charles A. 1968. Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Watanabe, Colin. 1973. "Self-Expression and the Asian American Experience," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51(February):390-396.

Weiss, Melford. 1970. "Selective Acculturation and the Dating Process: The Patterning of Chinese-Caucasian Interracial Dating," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32:273-278.

Wong, Buck. 1971. "Need for Awareness: An Essay on Chinatown San Francisco" in Roots: An Asian American Reader, Amy Tachiki, Eddie Wong and Franklin Odo, eds. Los Angeles: Continental Graphics.

Wong, Jade S. 1950. Fifth Chinese Daughter. New York: Harper Brothers.

Wong, Paul. 1972. "The Emergence of the Asian American Movement," Bridge, 2:32-39.

Wu, Robin. 1977. "Front Page Chinatown: What the *** is Going On?," Bridge, 5(Fall):4-7.

Wynne, Edward. 1976. "Schools that Serve Families," National Elementary School Principal, 55(August):6-15.

Yamamoto, Joe. 1968. "Japanese American Identity Crisis" in Minority Adolescents in the United States, Eugene Brody, ed. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Yang, C.K. 1959. The Chinese Family in the Communist Revolution. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Young, Michael. 1968. Forecasting and the Social Sciences. London: Heineman.

Young, Nancy F. 1972. "Socialization Patterns Among the Chinese in Hawaii," Amerasia Journal, 1(February):31-51.

A FAMILY

By
MAXINE HONG KINGSTON

Ms. Kingston wrote this paper for the conference but was unable to attend. The paper was distributed to all participants.

A FAMILY

Let me tell you some more about the family in the preceding article.* Four of them live on the salary my uncle makes as a baker, which sounds like a good job except that the bakery is in Chinatown, and he was not a baker in Hong Kong but a shoe maker. If he were working in a Caucasian shoe factory, I would worry less about him; Caucasians have a reputation for paying the minimum wage (although some of the sweat shops which seem to be run by Chinese actually have contracts with Caucasian corporations). Employers exploit the new immigrant, pay him almost nothing, and make him feel grateful for having a job at all, him with no experience and no English. Occasionally, there are spurts of union activity, attempts by restaurant and garment industry workers to organize themselves, but it is very easy to bust a union by threatening to get everybody deported.

My aunt used to add to the income with her job as a maid in one of the biggest San Francisco hotels. In addition to her minimum wage salary and the infrequent tips, she used to bring us the leftover soap. She has had to quit her job because of high blood pressure. My mother also has high blood pressure. This is not a disease peculiar only to our family but occurs with unusually high frequency among ethnic Chinese who have immigrated to the United States. According to more than one hundred physicians, sociologists and educators who met at a national symposium on high blood pressure in October, 1977, in San Francisco, high blood pressure is not a major threat to Chinese in China not to Chinese Americans born in the United States. They guessed that it is

---

* The article, also distributed at the conference, is entitled "Arnold Genthe and Chinatown," and was written for American Heritage. The family in reference is Ms. Kingston's aunt and uncle and their family.

not caused by racial genes but by social pressures in an alien country. Dr. Geoffrey Woo-Ming, medical director of the Northeast Medical Center, Said, "It was believed that tuberculosis was our greatest medical problem. We did a three-month study at the center and in that period we saw 2700 people. Four had tuberculosis and 461 hypertension." Most of the people with hypertension were like my aunt and mother, immigrants who do not speak English. American-born Asians did not have the same health problems, so Dr. Woo-Ming concluded that high blood pressure "is not an ethnic problem per se. The environmental factors play a major role."

Friends and neighbors who have the same symptoms have convinced my aunt, who has in turn convinced my mother, that drinking natural honey from a certain kind of bee raised on certain farms will effect a cure. Both of them have bought cases of honey, and they drink it by the quart. They claim to feel better as long as they drink the honey and skip the pills prescribed by their western doctors. Dr. Geoffrey Woo-Ming and Dr. Effie Poy Yew Chow, President of the East West Academy of Healing Arts, said in the San Francisco Chronicle, "The problem is particularly severe among older Chinese who are unable or unwilling to be integrated into the modern medical culture. There is great need for more Chinese-speaking doctors but an even greater need for a system that would combine elements of both modern and traditional Chinese medicine."

My aunt has suffered very much from not having a job. Because she was not bringing in money, my uncle accused her of being a liability and refused to give her any spending money. She did not know how to manage it, he said; the grocery prices could not possibly be that high. He did the shopping himself,

but she went on a cooking strike until he gave her money again. It is very difficult for the immigrant man to feel manly in this country. The customs are so different. I have another uncle who finds it unbearable that he has to carry grocery bags; in China his wife or his water buffalo did the carrying. Many times, in despair and self-assertion, he has set the groceries on the sidewalk and walked away with free arms like a real man. She has to take one bag home, and then hurry back for the other one before somebody steals it. I suppose this problem would be solved if they could afford a car.

My aunt has four children, two older ones by her first husband, who was killed during the Revolution in China. For a time, these two cousins were here in the United States without their parents. They were about 17 and 18. My mother let them live in our basement. They put themselves through college by working for 25 cents an hour at a supermarket; fringe benefits were meals and beds in the storage room. They went to two of the University of California campuses, and one finished with a B.S. in chemistry and the other in engineering. Few of us study the arts because it is easier to play along with the stereotype that we are good in technological fields and poor in verbal skills. With their degrees in hand, they found jobs working in canneries and in the fields. Their mother and my mother scolded them for being lazy good-for-nothings, but the latter asked me to write a bood entitled Unfair Hiring Practices. I am sure they did poorly during interviews, Chinese accents, shy Chinese mannerisms, no suits, funny haircuts. My brother, who had just returned from Vietnam, was facing similar obstacles, testing high but failing interviews, though he does not have an accent or dress oddly. Three years

after graduation, one of my cousins applied to graduate school, and the other, through his girl friend's relatives, found a job only remotely related to chemistry. My brother has a CETA job. Men with weaker characters have turned to crime.

My aunt and uncle's other two children are about eight and twelve years old. The girl is abnormally quiet, like the children I described in The Woman Warrior. About thirty years have passed between the time in that book and now; yet I see my own cousin afflicted with this pathological silence. I meet other little girls like that; people write to me about still more little girls. Teachers in Hawaii complain about the "cherry blossoms" in their classes and explain their silence as part of the Japanese geisha girl heritage, but I think silence is a condition imposed by the dominant culture.

The eight year old by also worries me. (Notice all I really do is worry, and will probably end up with high blood pressure myself, but it doesn't do any good for me to tell my aunt and my mother to stop drinking honey and to take their pills. And my silent cousin clams me up, myself susceptible to that silence.) When I was visiting my aunt, it was almost six o'clock and my cousin had still not come home. I kept asking her where he was, but she said she didn't know; sometimes he ran about in the Chinatown streets until midnight. I asked her if she were afraid of kidnappings and gangs, and she said she was, but she had lost control of him. He is indeed a wild boy, wise-cracking and insolent in two languages.

I often ask this aunt why doesn't she move out of Chinatown, but she has many reasons. Her husband's job is just around the block. "He can wake up five minutes before he's due at the bakery," she says. Also, the Chinese school is right across the street so the children don't have to take buses at night. "In Chinatown I can talk with the neighbors," she says.

I have been talking to people in the bilingual education programs. A Chinese-American school administrator tells me, "Don't tell anybody, but bilingual education doesn't work. There's only one way to learn a language -- immerse yourself in it. Bilingual programs work for everything else -- socializing, good self image -- but not for learning a language, either language. Bilingual programs work for everything but learning languages." Another teacher had said that he disagreed; the bilingual programs in his school had the effect of isolating minority students. The old system of American school by day and Chinese school by night would seem to work as well except that most young people don't want to go, an extra three hours of school per day, Saturday too, interfering with part-time jobs, sports, extracurricular activities. Almost everyone drops out of Chinese school by adolescence, and there is a language barrier as well as other barriers between generations.

On the other hand, an English as a Second Language teacher working in Los Angeles Chinatown, tells me that the bilingual programs are so new, it is unfair to give up on them just yet. I find the ESL teachers more optimistic than the teachers in bilingual programs. Sam Hom, director of the San Francisco Chinatown adult school program, says, "As soon as we schedule a class in English, it is filled.

Already we have a waiting list for another beginning English class. Naturally, the immigrants usually want to learn English as soon as possible. Otherwise they have to work only in places that don't require English -- as dishwashers in Chinatown, for example. These are low-paying jobs. A lot of places in Chinatown don't pay the minimum wage. And if they don't take the low-paying jobs, there are so many immigrants, there's always somebody else who'll take it." My father feels that enforcing the minimum wage laws would cause disastrous unemployment because the Chinatown businesses would have to fold.

Most people feel that their lack of English is the worst obstacle between themselves and American society. We are watching the effects of the $500,000 contract for English classes that the Department of Labor has signed with Cesar Chavez and the farmworkers.

That people are willing to work hard for 25 cents an hour -- lately I've heard 12 cents -- deflation -- proves that they do not use Medicaid, Aid to Dependent Children, Medicare, Food Stamps, welfare. This reluctance is not because of pride but the fear of getting involved with the government. As I mentioned in the above paper, the United States has had a history of refusing to classify ethnic Chinese as Americans but as aliens who can be deported at whim. Treaties have been broken and laws changed for the purpose of reducing the ethnic Chinese population. Laws have been made giving criteria for citizenship, and when Chinamen came out of hiding, new laws were passed with different criteria. Travellers to China have been issued return passes and these passes revoked by congressional acts as soon as the ships were out of the harbors.

Con men, like the Citizenship of Judges of Gold Rush days, are selling citizenship papers for $1500; they say they have Congress pass a special personal bill, as Congress had actually done for thousands of individuals during the Exclusion Acts. Many of us are not sure whether we are American citizens or not, and we are not about to ask the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Chinatown inhabitants would rather pay a thousand dollars or two to ransom a kidnapped child then complain to the police or the FBI.

I see no way of encouraging sick old women and lonely old men to apply for Food Stamps and Medicare as long as the INS continues to round up "aliens." Ethnic Chinese people know that what is happening at the Mexican-American border is part of a history of racism. In its handbook "The Rights of Aliens," the American Civil Liberties Union quotes some INS directives: to pick up and question without warrants people who "look Chinese," "wear foreign cut clothing," "carry their lunch in a brown paper bag," "look as if they are Spanish speaking." "Arrests of aliens in these circumstances," says the ACLU, "violate the Fourth Amendment's protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, but the courts have so far failed to acknowledge illegal arrests or to set aside any deportation order upon the ground of illegal arrest by INS officers." The ACLU quotes Judge Learned Hand: "Deportation is a dreadful punishment abandoned by the common consent of all civilized peoples." My mother has been working in canneries and fields where the INS comes sweeping through looking for Mexicans. I hear that when the police raid Chinatown gambling games, they bring INS officers along. The ACLU handbook says that the INS has officers stationed at hotels, restaurants, bus stops, busy streets, wherever "aliens" might gather.

This stopping anybody in the street and in the stores reminds my parents' generation of World War II, when they had to carry proof that they were "Chinese, not Japanese."

I myself have never been stopped, but am disturbed when television covers the INS announcements about "the silent invasion" by panning crowded streets in Chinatowns and Chicano neighborhoods and zooming in for close-ups of colorful, unidentified people who may very well be fourth- and fifth-generation Americans. If I ever see my picture in such a crowd, I think I'll sue for libel. Indeed, there will be Chinamen who will be angry at me for discussing immigration at all. Chinamen have been part of the United States since the colonial period; why should we, aping the dominant culture who can't tell the difference between a Chinese and a Chinese American, identify ourselves with recent immigrants?

One federal aid program that people are not afraid of is the hot lunches for senior citizens. That is, the old people tell me there are two programs, one which takes their names and commits them to appear for every meal. They prefer the other one which is "run by Filipinos" and allows them "freedom" because they can come for a meal whenever they choose. However, I know of a bunch of old men who say they can cook lunch with fresh greens for 17 cents, so why pay 35 cents for an overcooked white man's lunch? These old men have each had three quarters of a century of experience in scrounging food.

A bigger problem for the old men is housing. Fighting Chinatown evictions is the most popular cause among ethnic Chinese in Hawaii now. The issues are

similar to those concerning the International Hotel in San Francisco. A woman wrote from Scramento that her parents have lost their store "because it is near the financial district." She was bitter that "black people, who live in real slums, don't lose their buildings because they are not in desirable locations." The new freeway in Stockton slices through the middle of Chinatown. When Urban Renewal tore down our laundry, they said it was for a municipal parking lot, which it was for a while, but a couple of years later, the city must have sold the lot to the Bank of America because there is a bank on that spot now.

The Benevolent Associations do provide some housing for old men, but in recent years the Associations have not been the social force they were in the past, the activities of some Associations limited to the annual party, beauty contests, and anti-Communist propaganda. Also, when ethnic Chinese give to the poor, it is with a great deal of scorn, very condescending, like nobility dispensing largesse. The poor become the scapegoats; they get scolding along with the begrudging charity. For example, my parents housed my cousins in the basement when there was still room upstairs. Like the two fighting girls at the end of my book, victims fight with each other instead of uniting against a common enemy. Maybe the givers make being poor so unpleasant that the poor are forced to make some money to earn some respect. The Chinese have a custom of scolding children who get hurt.

There are rich Chinamen who will tell you that they have never met a poor Chinese American; we are smart, they say; we do well. I can only guess at the motives of people like that. Perhaps they are so wealthy that they have

isolated themselves with comfort and rich friends. I heard the wife of a legendarily rich Chinaman say on TV that we have our culture, which has helped us succeed in America. "That's why," she said, "I have never met a poor Chinese." She has bought the American myths and stereotypes -- that we have some mysterious oriental tradition that protects us, that the capitalist system works for minority peoples. I dislike immensely hearing Chinese Americans say, "I came from nowhere and I made it. If I can make it, they can make it," then go on to condemn deadbeats and welfare cheaters.

I realize that I am one of the more successful Chinese Americans. It has been mostly luck and parents who taught us how to rummage in garbage cans, trap pigeons, sew on bootstraps. In fact, I had an uncle who went crazy, classic paranoid schizophrenic, thinking about eating garbage.

Bibliography

Tin-Yuke Char, THE SANDALWOOD MOUNTAINS, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1975

Ron Chernow, "Chinatown, Their Chinatown: The Truth Behind the Facade," NEW YORK, June 11, 1973

Zoeth Skinner Eldredge, HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA, Vol. 4, The Century History Co., New York, 1915

Corinne K. Hoexter, FROM CANTON TO CALIFORNIA: THE EPIC OF CHINESE IMMIGRATION, Four Winds Press, New York, 1976

"Illegal Immigrants Are Flooding U.S.," Associated Press, STOCKTON RECORD, Dec. 26, 1976

Arlene Lum, "You Should Know," HONOLULU STAR-BULLETIN, February 17, 1977

Peter Lum, SIX CENTURIES IN EAST ASIA: CHINA, JAPAN, AND KOREA FROM THE 14TH CENTURY TO 1912, S.G. Philips, New York, 1973

Stanford M. Lyman, "Anti-Chinese Prejudice - A Documentation" (review of CHINK: A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF ANTI-CHINESE PREJUDICE IN AMERICA edited by Cheng-Tsu Wu), BRIDGE, Vol. 2 #3, February, 1973

MAKERS OF AMERICA series, Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., Volumes 5, 7, and 8, 1971

Judith and Neil Morgan, "California's Surprising Inland Delta," NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC, September, 1976

Victor G. and Brett De Bary Nee, LONGTIME CALIFORN': A DOCUMENTARY STUDY OF AMERICAN CHINATOWN, Pantheon Books, New York, 1972

Jerry Roberts and Elaine Herscher, "S.F. Hotel Tenants Insist Housing Is a Right, Not a Privilege," SEVEN DAYS, February 28, 1977

Carl Brent Swisher, Ph.D., MOTIVATION AND POLITICAL TECHNIQUE IN THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION 1878-9, Pomona College, Claremont, California, 193-

William L. Tung, THE CHINESE IN AMERICA 1820-1973, Oceana Publications, Inc., Dobbs Ferry, New York, 1974

Nancy Foon Young, THE CHINESE IN HAWAII: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1974

Judy Yung and Genny Lim, "Our Parents Never Told Us," CALIFORNIA LIVING MAGAZINE, January 23, 1977

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1978 O-269-819/6328